

THE
CHURCH REVIEW.

VOL. IX.

JULY, 1856.

No. 2.

ART. I.—HIGH CHURCH AND LOW CHURCH.

1. *The Church Review and Ecclesiastical Register.* New Haven, Ct.
2. *The Protestant Episcopal Quarterly Review.* New York.
3. *The True Catholic.* Baltimore, Md.
4. *The Southern Episcopalian.* Charleston, S. C.
5. *The Spirit of Missions.* New York.
6. *The Churchman's Monthly Magazine.* New York.
7. *Christian Witness and Church Advocate.* Boston, Mass.
8. *The Gospel Messenger.* Utica, N. Y.
9. *The Churchman.* New York.
10. *The Protestant Churchman.* New York.
11. *The Church Journal.* New York.
12. *The Parish Visitor.* New York.
13. *The Children's Magazine.* New York.
14. *The Carrier Dove.* New York.
15. *The Episcopal Recorder.* Philadelphia.
16. *Banner of the Cross.* Philadelphia.
17. *Southern Churchman.* Alexandria, Va.
18. *The Western Episcopalian.* Gambier, Ohio.
19. *The Calendar.* Hartford, Ct.

THIS is a goodly array of periodicals, to be published and paid for, read and digested in a Church, numbering about one hundred

and six thousand Communicants. We have placed the "Church Review" at the head of the list, not from a vain-glorious feeling, but simply out of regard to its age and size; although some of our newspapers are accustomed to speak of its young brother, "The Protestant Episcopal Quarterly," as the "stateliest and most valuable" of Church periodicals. We are in our ninth year; our "stately" contemporary is only two years old; and notwithstanding we have had from the first to earn our own living, and he is said to have been born "with a golden spoon in his mouth," we are not disposed, in this Republican country, to yield the palm to him on this account.

Let it not be supposed, however, that we have arranged the long catalogue which heads this Article, according to seniority, merit, or any similar principle. Just imagine what would ensue, if we should venture to give an opinion as to the comparative value of these Quarterlies, Monthlies, and Hebdomadals; pronouncing upon their respective literary excellence, soundness of doctrine, fairness and good temper in controversy. What would be the consequence, if we should intimate, in the most delicate and friendly manner, that the "Y—Z—" is not a model of intellectual strength, or as piquant and interesting as it might be; that it cribs a little too much from other papers and serves up the news after it is somewhat stale; that it is not always as chivalrous and courteous as St. Paul would be, under similar circumstances; what sort of a notice would the paper give of us? Something like the following:—"We have received the July No. of the Church Review. While there are occasional articles in this periodical that we can conscientiously commend, it gives us pain to state that too often sentiments are inscribed upon its pages, which are utterly at variance with our formularies of doctrine, and with Holy Scripture. It professes not to be identified with party and to represent the general views of the Church; but there is a deadly virus of error infecting its leaves, which the truly pious mind will readily detect. In judging others, it seems moreover to have a singular obtuseness of vision, and to be guided only by a blind and bitter prejudice. We hardly need to add, that we have no reference whatever to the views which are expressed in this No., of the religious press. We do not expect to receive candid consideration in that quarter."

Or, suppose we should try to be complimentary, and congratulate "The W—X—" upon the uniform tone of its editorials, in the topics and their mode of treatment, as indicative of a most zealous and exclusive devotion to what the writer considers the only form of truth worth considering; upon the ex-

emplary care with which the Editor prevents his readers from getting, through his columns, any adequate notion of anything which he sees fit to oppose; upon the magnificent assumption with which he criticises what would be impossible for him to comprehend; or, upon the delicate roughness with which he handles the reputation of Bishops, Priests, and Deacons, whose Office he professes almost idolatrously to venerate. What sort of a notice should we have from that region? Curt and comprehensive like this:—"The Church Review has fallen from its High estate into the hands of the Low Church faction. We advise our readers to drop it."

Now such words as these would be unpleasant, and, what is worse, they might lead some weak-minded brethren to withdraw their patronage; therefore we will not even intimate that our Religious Newspapers are not as immaculate, high-toned and truthful, as though they were edited by Apostles and printed by angels.

This thought, however, will force itself upon us; whether an equal amount of benefit would not accrue to the Church; whether there would not be somewhat less of personal bickering and petty controversy; whether these publications could not afford to make themselves more effective; if we had ten periodicals, where now we have twenty. It is as easy to make up a paper to be read by twenty thousand subscribers, as by two thousand; and the larger the subscription list, the greater is the stimulus and the wider are the facilities, to render the sheet worth reading. This suggestion we feel can be offered with safety; because every Editor will presume, if the number of Church periodicals should be reduced, he is the whale that must swallow up the little fishes.

Why is it that these publications are proportionally so much more numerous, in the Episcopal Church, than in other religious bodies? Are we such a reading community, and have we such a special hankering after this sort of literature, that nothing less can supply our wants? Two-thirds of our people neither take or read any religious periodical. The "Spirit of Missions" ought to have ten subscribers, where now it has one; a becoming sense of propriety forbids our saying how many should take the "Church Review." Do the different regions of the country require their own organs of communication, specially adapted to the necessities and peculiarities of those localities? To some extent this is true; but it does not explain the fact that we have sometimes two, and sometimes half a dozen periodicals, in the same city. Everybody knows that most of our papers are established to sustain the policy and views of some particu-

lar section in the Church ; and that if we were all of one mind, many of them would soon die a natural death. This brings us to the topic that we design to consider, which is, not directly the religious press, but a subject intimately connected with it, and almost as delicate and difficult to treat, without giving offense.

It is peculiar to the American Protestant Episcopal Church, that she retains her unity of organization and fellowship, through all the surgings of parties. Individuals at times drop off on the right hand and the left ; but no body of men ever leave her and set up a new communion. This is not true of any other Protestant organization in the land. We have Old School and New School Presbyterians ; Orthodox and Unitarian Congregationalists ; Gurneyite and Hicksite Quakers ; Methodist Church North, and Methodist Church South ; Calvinistic, Free-Will, Six-Principle, Seventh Day, and fifty other kinds of Baptists ; but only one body of Protestant Episcopalians. We are sometimes reproached, because of this tendency to cohesion, and it is said, we cannot be sundered, for the same reason that a rotten log is not easily split ;—the axe buries itself to the haft in the soft punk and sticks there. We do not know precisely what this means ; we certainly have enough of the life of controversy, and a most tender "mutual watch and care," in respect of all dogmatic questions. We have a superabundant legislative life, and have probably done more law-making than any other Christian community in modern times ; our Book of Canons, for elaborateness, minuteness and complication, is, in its way, quite a curiosity. Is it the want of spiritual life ? is it a prevailing spirit of indifferentism as to the great fundamentals of the Gospel, that holds us together ? There are Gallios in the Church, fancy religionists, dilettante theologians, men who inherit their religion as they do the family-plate, and value it on the same ground. But it is a slander to say that there is not amongst us as much genuine and healthy earnestness, as true an interest in the Faith, as can be found anywhere else. In this respect, we do not suffer by comparison with others. The Gospel of Christ is fervently, zealously and faithfully preached, by High-Churchmen and by Low-Churchmen. There are indeed "spots in our feasts of charity," and so there were, when inspired Apostles presided over the Church.

It is certainly a question worthy of serious consideration, what it is which binds the Episcopal Church into one cohesive body, while political, practical and doctrinal differences are sundering all other Protestant Communions. This Church is

subject to the same outward pressure, it is made up of the same human material, and there is amongst us the same variety of opinion, as to the social questions which agitate the community. But there is an all-controlling force in the principle, recognized universally amongst us, that the Church is a *Divine organization* in all its essential forms as well as dogmas. Growing out of this principle there is a sentiment of loyalty, which pervades Clergy and Laity of all grades of Churchmanship; and this is so strong that no supposed or real grievance ever suggests the fatal remedy of schism.

There is another peculiarity of this Church, which makes it possible for conscientious men, of different views, to live in outward unity; and that is the breadth of our doctrinal basis. The Faith of the Church is that which has been received from the beginning. Her Creed is historical, not metaphysical. While there may be a general assent to a certain philosophical digest of doctrine, no one has a right to judge his brother by any unwritten law. If the General Convention should set forth an exposition of the Faith, in accordance with the peculiar views of either party in the Church, and make this authoritative, the bond of unity would be instantly and irrevocably sundered. The free play of private judgment is based upon the universal deference to primitive authority; this allows motion about a fixed point, and while there may be a degree of occasional aberration, all revolve around the same central sun.

And in these two general principles we have the only sure ground of organic or doctrinal Unity. Among the Congregationalists every parish organizes itself after its own fashion, and makes its own Creed. This is an actual renunciation of the principle of Unity. The Presbyterians meet together in General Assembly, and legislate into being a Confession of Faith, in which the most minute and subtle points of doctrine are moulded into an elaborate, rigid, cast-iron system, which it would require a lifetime of study to comprehend with sufficient thoroughness, for one intelligently to affirm or deny it. There can be no catholic consent to such a scheme as this. The Romanist recognizes an unchangeable and infallible tribunal, which is constantly adding to the substance of the Faith. The Unity of his Church must therefore be, at the same time, a fixed and a variable quantity.

That the oneness of the Protestant Episcopal Church must rest upon some very substantial basis, is proved by the fact of her having passed safely through ordeals, which, amongst other bodies of Christians, would have resulted, if not in a

general division, at least in the secession of a large section *en masse*. The time has not yet come for an impartial and complete history of what is called the Oxford Tractarian Movement. All will allow, however, that the integrity and essential Protestantism of the Church could hardly have been subjected to a severer test than has been endured during the last fifteen or twenty years. The feeling in which the Oxford movement *originated*, must have the sympathy of every American Churchman, let his party predilections be as they may. We must bid God speed to every honest effort that is made to take the Church of England out of the control of the State, and secure to her an independent life. There is not a more extraordinary anomaly on the face of the earth than this, of a body, claiming a Divine origin, a Divine Constitution, a Divine Creed, and yet legislated for by a Parliament, liable to be made up of Jews, infidels and heretics! her Bishops appointed by the Crown! questions of doctrine determined by Civil Courts! discipline impossible except at great pecuniary cost! and Church livings in the hands of individuals, who may, if they please, sell them to the highest bidder! But the Oxford writers very soon assumed a revolutionary, rather than a reformatory aspect. As has often been the case in matters both political and ecclesiastical, these men in the beginning little dreamed whereunto their efforts would grow, and would have repelled with honest indignation the charge that the ablest of them would eventually be landed in the Church of Rome. And yet it is now very evident that they were engrafting into the Church a foreign element, which, if it had taken vital hold, would have entirely superseded the Reformed Faith. The Church of England would not, perhaps, have bowed her neck before the feeble old gentleman, who tyrannizes over the Italian States;—political and social reasons might have prevented this;—Dr. Newman and his friends would probably never have assumed the Papal livery; but the Anglican Communion would have become, in rites, dogma, and modes of influence, a new existence; she would have sundered herself from the Science, the Literature, and the progressive life of the age; free and living men would have gradually repudiated allegiance to her standard; intolerance would have triumphed over charity; the simplicity of the Faith would have been overlaid and smothered with meretricious subtleties; and infidelity armed with weapons forged in the armories of the Church. At the time when the Oxford Tracts first gained attention on the other side of the Atlantic, there was little in the condition of the Episcopal Church in this country

that would indicate the probability of their obtaining any extensive hold amongst us. The lethargy of a former period had been shaken off; the Church had entered upon a new career of enterprise and growth; the Gospel was preached in her pulpits with fresh fervor; Missionary labors at home and in foreign lands were energetically commenced; religious services were multiplied; Clerical Associations for intellectual and spiritual improvement were formed in many of our Dioceses; the lines of party seemed to be quietly fading out; Christians of various names, weary of strife and schism, were turning towards this Church with anxious interest; large accessions came to the ranks of our Clergy from the Ministry of different denominations, and from Maine to Georgia we took up the song,

"Triumphant Zion, lift thy head,
From dust, and darkness, and the dead."

At this crisis, there came a voice over the sea from the cloisters of Oxford, which met with a wonderfully harmonious response in the American branch of the Church. New usages suddenly appeared, or at least obsolete forms re-appeared; bells rung for daily matins and vespers that had been heard before only on the Sundays; white linen appeared in pulpits where black silk had been used to rustle; Chancels were cleared of lumbering furniture to make way for elevated Altars; the Fathers began to be quoted instead of the Reformers; certain of the Low Church brethren suddenly shot up fifty degrees above their old-fashioned High Church neighbors; some exacted, others groaned; some predicted a speedy Millennium, and others the final apostasy and the end of the present Dispensation. Some good things were done, and many that were foolish and absurd; the general effect of the movement was division within the Church, and distrust without. Notwithstanding all this, the Church has made great progress during the last twenty years, but no one can tell how much faster it would have grown, if these obstructions had not lain in the way.

But the force of the Tractarian onslaught may now be fairly considered as broken. We still hear the heaving of the ground-swell, that follows the tempest, and occasionally a stick or two of drift-wood is thrown upon the banks of the Tiber as a memorial of the storm, but the raging of the winds is over. That this movement has passed its crisis appears in the fact that the literature to which it gave birth, is no longer in demand; the books lie uncalled for on the dusty shelves of the publishers. They may be bought very cheap at the "Trade

Sales." They were never very readable, whether written on one side of the controversy or the other, and nothing but the excitement of the contest could ever have given them currency. Soon after the appearance of a famous Tract on Baptism, we heard a clerical friend remark that he had read it through three times without detecting its meaning, and had now commenced to read it backward, with the hope of better success. Scraps from the Fathers on the one side, long citations from the Reformers on the other; catenas to prove this, opposite catenas to prove that; *disjecta membra*, from which the most accomplished Theological Cuvier would find it impossible to determine the original species of the writer; one who was cut off from all other resources, and shut up for life in a solitary cell, might manage to digest this, but it is marvelous that free-agents should ever have chosen such a style of reading. As we have before remarked, the original impulse of the Tractarian movement is spent; and the leaders have either made their submission to the Roman pontiff, or retired from public observation. The Church has lost some whom it could poorly afford to spare, and others who will not be greatly missed.

In accordance with the natural law of re-action, we may anticipate that the next aggressive and energetic party action will come from the opposite side of the Church. The popular impression that "Tractarianism" is the legitimate development of High Church principles, and Popery the inevitable terminus of "Tractarianism," gives to the antagonistic party at the present moment an important advantage. And no candid person will deny that the "Evangelical" section of the Church has sometimes rendered important service in sustaining or reviving the flame of spiritual life, when it seemed ready to perish. Some of the brightest names that adorn the records of the Church, both in England and America, are those of men who were distinctively and avowedly members of that party. We do not indeed estimate these eminent Christians exactly by the standard of their biographies; the "Lives of the Saints," ancient and modern, generally contain somewhat of the mythical element. We never meet in real life, any persons who are precisely like those we read of in good books, and there is no doubt that many of those excellent men, whose memories have been embalmed in sweet spices by their admiring biographers, if they should read their own Lives in Paradise, would be not a little astonished to find that they had walked so uniformly in the ante-chamber of Heaven, while in the flesh. Making, however, all due allowance for the excessive laudation which is heaped upon the memory of departed believers, we must

still allow that no party of men in any Church can point to a more goodly array of devoted, self-sacrificing, and holy servants of Christ, than the "Evangelical" section of the Anglican and American Episcopal Communion. We are indebted to them in a great measure for the religious enterprise which now distinguishes the operations of the Church; they sounded the trumpet of alarm when Christians were slumbering in Zion, and the higher spiritual life that we enjoy is, in a large degree, attributable to the solemn protest which they uttered against the indifference, the worldliness, the formal routine, the frigid ethics, which characterized both Laity and Clergy, during the greater part of the last century.

At the same time, it is not to be desired that this, or any other party, should secure exclusive control of the Church. The range of thought and sentiment and action, which the "Evangelical" system allows, is too narrow to allow it to become the basis of Catholic Union. There are faculties belonging to our nature, which it does not recognize, at least in their connection with religion; it revolves too exclusively around a few, fixed dogmas, which are regarded as embracing the whole Gospel; it sets forth a type of religious life, which is somewhat technical, and too entirely divorced from the ordinary processes of the mind and heart; it makes too little of moral growth and culture, and too much of its own spiritual specifics; and notwithstanding its protest against formalism, it sometimes clings to the letter, at the cost of the spirit.

It is, again, more or less directly affiliated with a theology, which is saved from fatalism only by becoming illogical; which in its *theory*, represents all personal effort on the part of the sinner as useless or superfluous; exhibits God as dealing with His creatures in the character of an arbitrary Sovereign; sin as the result of an arbitrary connection with our first parents; and salvation as deliverance from an arbitrary penalty.

Neither does this system fairly meet the intellectual necessities of the world. It takes too much for granted; reasons too much in a circle; shrinks too sensitively from criticism; evades objections which it ought to solve; ignores too uniformly the suggestions of Science, and relies too confidently upon its own infallibility. Its power consists, mainly, in the hold which it gets upon the religious sensibilities; the earnestness of the teacher enkindles a corresponding earnestness in his hearer.

But when the "Evangelical" *formula* remains, after the pious spirit which pervaded and worked it, has evaporated, and it degenerates into the mere watch-word of a party, there is nothing more tedious and unedifying. In its best estate, it is not

always a genial and whole-sided form of religion; it is apt to assume that all religious emotions are spurious, which do not coëxist with its own precise dogmatic belief; it is somewhat given to sit in rigid censorship upon those who hold a different form of Faith; it is eloquent in defense of the abstract right of private judgment, but woe to him who exercises that right in the wrong direction! and though it recognizes the three Christian graces of "faith, hope, and charity," it would never have originated the statement that "the greatest of these is charity."

We speak now of this system in its more extreme and partisan development; and if this form of ultraism should ever get control of the Church, we may look for a very uncomfortable amount of proscription and intolerance. If, however, the genuine piety, the ardent zeal, the active holiness, which have made the name of "Evangelicalism," in its best manifestations, so sacred, could be combined with true conservatism, the blessed freedom of the Gospel, cultivated taste, and a liberal comprehensiveness; if this system could be brought into harmony with the higher forms of Science and Art, Philosophy and Literature, we should have such a glorious combination, that all party lines would be utterly and forever obliterated. As it is, it would be disastrous if either of those extremes which exist amongst us, should get a clear and indisputable supremacy. There is, indeed, little cause to apprehend that such will be the case; the great body of our Clergy are quietly discharging their proper duties, with very little interest in the warfare which a few uneasy spirits are disposed to wage, and the mass of the Laity do not even know what are the points in dispute. We are in no danger of being brought under an ecclesiastical or a dogmatic yoke,—the genius of the Church forbids it; neither are we exposed to the disruptions of schism,—the genius of the Church forbids this also; no Diocese, no body of men amongst us, dare hint at Nullification.

And still there are certain movements which indicate that we may be called to settle this practical question:—whether the Unity of the Church shall be a mere *formal Unity*, or not? We may retain our present organization intact, and all our articles, usages and forms remain as they are, while, so far as concerns our Missionary operations, the education of Candidates for Holy Orders, and the dissemination of Religious Literature, we act as two distinct bodies; so that, while we call ourselves one Church, acknowledge one Lord, one Faith, and one Baptism, we are operating upon the world in opposite directions. Both parties will allow that such a state of things is to be deprecated; but each says, it is better than it would be to allow the opposite side to have control of our Institutions.

Is there then no common ground, broad enough to allow all the loyal sons of the Church to stand together, and work together? If not, then the boasted Unity of the Church is a delusion. If there is no definite System of Truth, clearly revealed in her formularies, and which contains all that the Christian needs to know for his soul's health, then we say that the Church has not *one* Faith, or any particular Faith at all. If we must incorporate into our oral or printed teaching, shreds of Romish doctrine, fragments of mediaeval nonsense; or, on the other hand, cull our theology from the fields of Geneva and the pastures of Dissent; if we must supersede the simple, historical Faith which distinguishes this Church from other Christian bodies, substituting for it the refined and sublimated schemes of doctrine, which men have elaborated; if we must go out of our way to affirm, or deny, the validity of Orders and Ordinances, with which we have no practical concern, at the risk of being branded as "unsound Churchmen" by one party, or as "unevangelical" by the other; if either Sacramental or forensic theories of Justification, are to be made the tests of orthodoxy, then farewell to peace and unity.

And while we are contending about matters, which few will dare affirm are vital to our salvation, what is going on around us? While we are defining the operations of Grace in Baptism, and localizing the Divine presence in the Eucharist, what recognition is there of either Sacrament by the great majority of men? While we are philosophizing over the nature of Original Sin, and contending about the diagnosis of depravity, what are the workings of "actual transgression" in the community? While we are discussing the relative authority of the Church and the Scriptures, what are our young men learning from Strauss, and Hennel, and Newman, and Gregg? The whole tone of modern Literature, scientific, philosophical, ethical, poetical, critical, historical, periodical, clearly shows that there is soon to be a mighty contest, in which the fact of a Supernatural Religion will be the point at issue. What preparation are we making for the battle? We may say, carelessly, it will only be the old objections over again, and they have been disposed of already; there is nothing new to be urged on either side. No man who really knows anything of the matter; no man who has read the rationalistic and infidel writers of the day; no man who is familiar with the subtle and ingenious modes with which they ply the argument of unbelief, will dare to dismiss the subject in this summary way. We may hide our heads in the sand, when the enemy approaches; we may presume upon the ignorance of our auditors, measuring their intelligence

by our own; we may go on, week after week, administering stale platitudes to dozing congregations; we may jog along in our little circle of routine, like the blind mule who grinds bark in the mill, and after traveling all day, always finds himself at night where he started in the morning; we may affirm and re-affirm that everything is settled, but this does not hinder the earth from heaving.

And while the cohorts of infidelity are wheeling into line on one side, on the other there lies a huge mass of worldliness and indifference,—multitudes who do not care enough about religion to disbelieve, and upon these, the Church is making no impression! They have learned to laugh at our disputes, and therefore they scorn our exhortations. Would that our belligerent Christians might carefully ponder these timely words of Mr. Kingsley: "If you had seen (as I have) pious parents destroying in their own children's minds all faith, all reverence for holy things, by mixing themselves up in religious controversies, and indulging by their own firesides in fierce denunciations of men no worse than themselves;—if you will watch (as you may) young people taking refuge, some in utter frivolity, saying, 'What am I to believe? When religionists have settled what religion is, it will be time enough for me to think of it; meanwhile, let me eat and drink, for to-morrow I die;'—and others, the children of strong Protestant parents, taking refuge in the apostate Church of Rome, and saying, 'If Englishmen do not know what to believe, Rome does; if I cannot find certainty in Protestantism, I can in Popery;'—if you will consider honestly and earnestly these sad tragedies, you will look on it as a sacred duty to the children whom God has given you, to keep aloof as much as possible from all those points on which Christians differ, and make your children feel, from their earliest years, that there are points, and those the great, vital root points, in which all more or less agree, which many members of the Romish Church have held, and, I doubt not, now hold, as firmly as Protestants,—adoption by one common Father, justification by the Blood of one common Saviour, sanctification by one common Holy Spirit."

We have not room to dwell at length upon the manifold evils which the Church suffers from the prevalence of party strife. The immense loss which it occasions in the working power of the Church, is obvious. There may be a degree of wholesome rivalry, where various parties aim at the same result through different modes; but not when each considers the others as workers of mischief. We do not indeed view it as an evil, that there should be different layers of opinion in

the same Communion,—the law of our being makes this inevitable; and such differences need not at all impair efficiency of action in the body. The perfection of a great machine may require that there should be a multitude of wheels, of different diameters and moving at various rates of speed; but it is another thing when the impulsive force is expended upon *counteracting* movements.

If an unsound principle in ethics or theology is broached, of course it must be resisted, at whatever cost; but what we complain of, is fierce and unbrotherly contention about points of difference, which the Church has virtually pledged herself to tolerate. And these are the very matters which form the basis of existing divisions; if it were not so, each party would be bound to strike directly for the *expulsion* of the opposite party.

This leads us to notice another practical evil, which injures the Church by making it ridiculous; and that is, the excessive importance given to things, in themselves trifling and insignificant. It looks as though we were not very much in earnest as to the great objects for which the Church exists, when questions of posture, and vestments, and furniture, and ornaments, are made prominent. It does not look as though we appreciated the momentous nature of the battle we are to wage, when the tie of a sword-knot is cared for, more than the temper of the blade. It is an awful thing to see parishes divided, Churches emptied, the peace of families disturbed, and confidence in the Ministry shaken, because of the pertinacity with which one party will insist upon the introduction of some obsolete ceremony, some trifling innovation, which, though in itself harmless enough, and perhaps an actual improvement in point of taste and beauty, has, connected with it, such associations as to make it an offense to a large portion of the congregation. And again, on the other side, it is both mournful and amusing, to see the flaming up of holy indignation, the outburst of Protestant feeling, when the Rector ventures to make the Service of the Sanctuary more orderly and impressive, by the removal of vulgar and incongruous usages. One section can pray to edification only before a stone Altar, with embroidered cloths; another prefers to receive the Communion from a mahogany toilet-table, highly polished, and with elaborately carved legs. One can read and preach with proper unction only from a bronze eagle or a simple music-stand; another feels that the pure Gospel can be uttered, only from a spacious enclosure of timber, duly fenced in on the four sides, and furnished like a fashionable drawing-room. One is not happy, unless he can have his sedilia and credence-table and litany desk, and gilded crosses, and double choir and anti-

phonal singing, and a general marching and counter-marching through the services; another takes fright, when the Psalms of David are chanted in good English prose, instead of being doled forth in prosaic poetry, and scents the effluvia of Popery in the sweet fragrance of fresh flowers, blushing in the font on Easter festivals.

The prominence given to matters of this sort, does not help the reputation of the Church, nor does it conduce to our own intellectual or moral elevation. When the mind deals habitually with small things, it gradually contracts itself to the narrow dimensions of the subjects, with which it has to do.

Another of the worst evils resulting from the predominance of party feeling, is, that it blocks the progress of wholesome improvement in the Church. There are some such changes, which almost all allow to be in themselves desirable, and which almost all consider at present impracticable. If anything of this sort is proposed to be done, each party is afraid the other will derive some advantage by it; and so, by common consent, the brakes are applied, and the wheels stand still. And it is singular to see how those who agree in nothing else, instantly join forces to stay action, whenever any improvement or modification in the mechanism of the Church is suggested. If the "Memorial" movement comes to nothing, which is most probable, it will be, not because the wise and far-seeing portion of the Church do not feel that some action in that direction is demanded, but because of the superstitious fears of party. Large and unwieldy Dioceses must remain undivided, because each party is afraid the other side will elect the new Bishop. The Calendar of Lessons cannot be revised, and we must continue to read long extracts from the Levitical Law on the days of solemn Fasting, because one party fears lest, in the revision, the Apocrypha will be struck out; and the other party, that more of the Apocrypha will creep in. We must go on forever, reading as an Exhortation in the Confirmation Office, what was originally a rubric, and often sounds ludicrously inappropriate, lest the new Introduction should lean towards a High Church or a Low Church view of the ordinance. The stiffnecked High Churchman opposes all change, on the ground of consistency; the supple-jointed Low Churchman, who has never been over-scrupulous in rubrical conformity, opposes all change, in order to secure a quasi reputation for sound Churchmanship. One says, nothing can be improved; the other says, let every man modify the Service according to his own convictions of expediency.

But, after all, the grand evil attendant upon a narrow,

bigoted' partisanship, is, its demoralizing influence. The scenes which are sometimes exhibited in our Conventions, would not be likely to convert intelligent infidels to Christianity. The tactics of party may be conducted as adroitly, perhaps as unscrupulously, as they are in political campaigns. It is at times difficult to see any special difference between the celestial anger of ecclesiastical disputes, and the profane wrath of the world. Under a given excitement, men who preach very mildly in their own pulpits, will thunder very boisterously in Convention. Neither does the uproar of party tend to the cultivation of a scrupulous regard for truth. Slanders are put into circulation, without any very thorough investigation of the ground on which they rest. Devices are adopted, for the discomfiture of the enemy, which are not entirely in accordance with the principles of the New Testament. The Clergy and Laity, when the waves of party run high, may assemble in Council, and afterwards go home, without having been much advanced in the Christian life, by thus coming together.

All this, it might not be expedient to say, except that everybody knows it to be true. And why does the Church, after having existed for eighteen hundred years, still continue to embrace so small a fraction of the world's population? Why has there been no *national* conversion to Christianity, for more than ten centuries? If we are to go on, simply repeating the processes of the past, torn with the same intestine feuds, magnifying mole-hills into mountains, expending our best strength upon matters subordinate and incidental, how long will it be before the earth is brought under the dominion of the Cross? We must return to the Primitive basis of Unity; we must have a broader vision, a truer charity, a purer zeal; the Church must reproduce the character, the doctrine, the spirit of Christ more faithfully, or that day is far distant when the Kingdoms of the world shall become the Kingdoms of our Lord and of His Son.

ART. II.—PRESCOTT'S HISTORY OF PHILIP THE SECOND.

History of the Reign of Philip the Second, King of Spain.

By WILLIAM H. PRESCOTT, Corresponding Member of the Institute of France, the Royal Academy of History at Madrid, etc., etc. Vols. I and II. Boston: Phillips, Sampson & Co. 1855.

To be classed with the brilliant galaxy of writers, by whom the department of History has been of late adorned, argues the possession of no common ability, in addition to varied and extensive acquirements. But to be placed in the front rank of this remarkable cluster is an honor, we believe, generally conceded to be due to the indefatigable student and the graphic delineator of the annals of Spain.

Mr. Prescott unites some of the most important accomplishments in himself of an able historian; untiring patience, well-balanced and impartial judgment, ideal power to reproduce the past, thoroughness, accuracy, discrimination, charity—with a style and manner in unfolding his gifts every way equal to his historic lore. With less of rhetoric than the eloquent Macaulay, he is yet scarcely less captivating, while he is always reliable. With less of philosophy than the learned Hallam, or the thoughtful Arnold, he yet rivets the links of historic connection with a just appreciation of organic relationship. He does not affect to philosophize on the record, or to conduct the story along its hidden channels which underlie the surface; but without such profession he introduces the reader to an inward standpoint, from which he can see for himself what are the bearings, and causes, and consequences of events, which are threaded skillfully together with a due regard to affinity.

Mr. Prescott excels in highly ornamental painting—in presenting a series of magnificent pictures, or tableaux, perhaps, which carry us back into an actual fairy land, gorgeous with the splendors of an oriental pageant. Remarkably happy in the choice of his periods, he has not to draw for poetic embellishment upon the domain of fancy; but he is helped to material out of the subject itself. Fond of looking at history through a panorama of cathedrals and palaces, and fêtes, or through a gallery of art hung with shields and trophies, as the ancient Ninevite, he carves upon the tablet enduring reliefs with his faithful chisel, which speak to the eye with a living power—

while at the same time he accompanies the striking picture with its profounder teachings.

It is a cause of congratulation, in a day when the archives of the fortress of Simancas and other rich repositories of Castilian annals have been thrown open to the public, that so competent an explorer should be raised up to examine them in the person of our distinguished and accomplished countryman. We may be grateful perhaps to a beneficent Providence for carrying out the purposes of a kindly Nature, in inflicting on Mr. Prescott that organic infirmity, which has incidentally shut him up to this department of toil. Notwithstanding the obstacles with which he has had to contend, he has struggled manfully through them; while his very discouragements have acted no doubt by their continual pressure, to stimulate both his moral and intellectual energies. It is not the first time, that an admiring world has been called to render thanks for blinded orbs in its favorites—which, being dulled to the present—have sought the field for their exercise in the past or in the future.

Philip the Second came to the possession of power at a very remarkable period in modern times. The Reformation of religion—already in progress for nearly forty years—was making its impatient way through middle and northern Europe. The Council of Trent was protracting its fitful sessions. One of the proudest monarchs of any age of the world had just abdicated his throne in favor of his royal son, and had retired himself to monastic quiet. Surrounded in his reign with sovereigns of note, who would have shone more conspicuously but for his towering genius—Francis the First and Henry the Eighth, Leo the Tenth, Solyman the Second and Sigismund the First—it was the privilege of Charles to deliver up his kingdom to his lawful heir with the overshadowing glories of an age of princes. The Austrian ruler had wielded his potent sceptre over Naples and Sicily, the Duchy of Milan, Franche Comte and the Netherlands, the vast domain of Germany, and the now united realms of Castile and Aragon. Tunis, Oran and Cape Verde in Africa, with the fair Canaries—the Sunda and Phillippine Islands on the skirts of Asia, with a part of the Moluccas;—in America, the dominions of Peru and Chili, Mexico and parts adjacent, and many other dependencies in the West Indian group acknowledged his kingly sway. Upon this almost boundless empire, stretching itself around the globe, the sun never set. Commensurate with its range were its wealth and vigor, and the never-sleeping ambition of him who ruled it. The silver mines of Potosi and Mexico, and the golden treasure-houses of Peruvian Incas—piled up with bars of massive ore—poured their

rich tribute into its coffers. Its fleet was the most numerous that rode the seas; and its troops of soldiers trained to ceaseless warfare, and led on by generals of a score of battles, were the best in Europe. The power of the Turk had been successfully stayed by them before the walls of Vienna, and rolled back like a billow into the deep. France had been kept by an almost unbroken series of victories from transcending her limits. The war of the peasants had been repressed in Germany. The league of the Protestant princes, until a very recent moment, had been put at defiance. The heterogeneous elements of a vast, unwieldy empire, had been preserved entire, notwithstanding the causes for a total dismemberment, by the twofold chain of commanding wisdom and soldierly prowess.

But when Charles the Fifth actually laid aside his purple, misfortune and reverse had begun to cast their shadows. The last days of his power were marked by a waning glory—by his precipitate flight before the Saxon elector, and the disastrous siege of the city of Metz. It had long been the purpose of this chivalrous monarch to resign both his sword and crown to Philip, as soon as the latter should be able to bear them. The time for this surrender came slowly on. The unsettled strifes which the father was unwilling to bequeath his child, lingered long upon the hands of the weary parent, and put off continually his anxious intent. At length, however, a cessation of hostilities was formally agreed to, by both France and Spain, for five years to come. Like an astute warrior, who sees that there are contests yet to wage—and who, instead of risking any longer by exposure the loss of the head which alone can direct, prefers to look from the securities of a watch-tower upon the struggle that threatens on the field below—he exchanged the activity of camp and court for the retirement of Yuste.

We look upon the abdication of the noble Emperor as neither selfish altogether, nor yet as wholly religious. A mixture of religion was doubtless found in his motives. But in addition to this he felt beyond a question his inability to labor as he had done already—to endure the fatigues of a weary march, or to bear the shock of a battle—and deeming that two heads were better than one, he withdrew to be a counselor, adviser, supporter, while the execution of purposes was left to his heir. In this view of the subject we can hardly fail to be confirmed by the continuance of Charles, after his establishment at Yuste, to interest himself in affairs of state. He was as much a diplomatist in a monastery as he had been in a palace. In constant correspondence with the king and the regents, he was apprised of every occurrence of mishap or success, and participated actively

in meeting its issues. Nothing is more striking than the sort of spiritual ubiquity with which he was able to be present in all parts of the kingdom. He seemed to have changed from a simply bodily actor in a single locality, to a multiplied mental director in every quarter of Europe.

Strange life was that of the uncrowned head of a mighty dominion in the still shades of an Abbey. Fancy draws to us the picture of a cloistered monk shut up in the walls of his contracted cell—the shirt of hair-cloth chafing his skin—a pallet of straw his bed, and continual fastings and vigils his engrossing duty. It paints us an eremite, dead to whatever concerns the world, and wrapt in contemplations of heaven and a better life with God. The devout Romish ascetic would fain have us believe that this is a portraiture of Charles the recluse.

But behold the contrast to this ideal drawing, which the unlying papers in the archives of Simancas have brought lately to view; behold a modest addition to the monastic home, a separate establishment built by Charles himself in the inviting retreat to which he had turned his steps—a retinue of fifty household servants and chosen courtiers forming his family—his principal apartment hung with costly tapestries—the pencil of Titian adorning its walls—rich pillowy chairs on sumptuous carpets indulging his pains—the air without perfumed by odors wafted from orange groves and gardens of citron beneath the windows—the choicest music in the adjoining chapel—eloquence from the lips of Jeronymite monks selected on purpose for the royal pleasure, to refresh his piety and to delight his ear—a daily banquet served on silver platters, such as the stately feasts of an epicurean court could hardly surpass, either for variety or rarity, though medical care on one side of the table stood to condemn imprudence, and religion on the other to rebuke carnal appetite. And instead of the high converse of a stranger to earth and his undisturbed tranquillity—behold a daily sensibility to the deep throbbings of society which beat at the great heart of the world without—which were felt for by the sovereign, and felt too by his majesty as anxiously as by the actors in life's thrilling drama.

Mr. Prescott's digression into an account of the last days of this modern Diocletian, is a most interesting chapter; and though anticipated through the press by the "Cloister Life," by Mr. Sterling, is too valuable a fragment to be thrown aside from his pages. We are glad that the account has been retained by its author, and embodied in the form of a permanent history.

Now while Charles was thus dividing between devotion and

politics, we must not forget that his heir—his single child by Isabella of Portugal—was beginning to wield the fortunes of Europe. Upon the retirement of his father, we have seen that the empire had reached its zenith, and even passed the meridian. Shorn of a portion of the honors of the sovereign before him by the transfer of Germany into the hands of Ferdinand, Philip at first would have been less powerful than his illustrious sire, but for his alliance by marriage with the Queen of England; an alliance by the way which added little to his power beyond the exertion of his personal influence. He was invested with no authority over the realm of his consort, nor even with a title to future succession, except through the issue of their wedded bonds.

It was the ambition of Charles, in addition to a union with the English Queen, to secure to Philip the imperial sceptre, by persuading his brother, the uncle of Philip, to relinquish his claims to the Germanic throne. Had this request been granted, the most extensive kingdom, since the irruption of the northern hordes, would have been placed within the hope of a single chief—and there is no predicting what would have been the consequence. The arms of Spain were already stretched out over the best of Europe. She had brought to her aid by marriage and treaty, and by conquest abroad, such means of strength, that nothing but the rivalry of her Gallican neighbor could check her progress. Yes—there was an additional hindrance to her onward march, which was better than the jealousies of the crown of France. There was a power like the stone cut out of the mountain, which was daily augmenting in its secret places, raising its stern antagonism with a yet bolder front every year and month—which was destined to arrest the career of Philip, and even to despoil him of some of his fairest heritage. The sturdy blows struck by Luther at the Papacy, and through that, at tyrants, had made a kingdom tremble. Already had the princes of the Protestant states forced a monarch to treat. The influence of the movement which was begun in Saxony, was felt beyond the Rhine: it had crossed the Alps, and scaled the Pyrenees, and was even perceptible to the very pillars of Hercules. While ill successes with this on the part of Charles put Philip to disadvantage in attempting to follow him, the difficulties brewing in the condition of Christendom, revolutionary tendencies and causes of war made it exceedingly perilous for the youthful helmsman who was now to undertake to outride the storm.

All the elements of decay, it is very easy to see, were either active or latent in Philip's dominions, before he began to

reign. Nothing but a wise and comprehensive policy could prevent their ferment. A more ill-assorted and unnatural union we can hardly conceive of, than that which existed between Spain and Flanders. Different in temperament, alike as in pursuits and tastes, the one proud and grave—the other joyous, frank, genial, lively; one fond of war—the other of the arts of peace; one closely wedded to its ancient customs—the other progressive, and full of inventive genius; like their country, hemmed in by walls of sea and sierras, the one exclusively and intensely national—the other, like their lowlands, open to all the approaches of surrounding regions, drinking in a catholic and comprehensive spirit; inclining to opposite standards under the Christian name, with no political sympathy, no commercial relations, mutually jealous on account of the changing partialities of their sovereign in common—they could never have cohered if left to themselves, and must inevitably have separated upon the mere removal from them of external bonds of connection and restraint.

To the warmhearted Flemings, Charles the Fifth had been a universal favorite, because he was born in Flanders, and had imbibed their generous and cordial sentiments from his cradle up. All his courtiers were Flemish magnates. Even his attendants in Spain were brought from Flanders—so that the proud Castilians justly took offense at his obvious leanings to their northern rival. Philip, on the contrary, was a native of Spain, and the hauteur and coldness of his peninsular subjects found their complete embodiment in this princely scion. He disgusted the Flemings by his frigid reserve. He offended the nobility, both at Brussels and Westminster, by his supercilious carriage. It was not in his nature to condescend to others. To be affable was a pain to him. To extend common civilities appears to have been forced and irksome service. He moved among men as one born to command, and less by the magic of personal character, than by the authority of superior station. He dwelt within himself;—he had few sympathies with his race. In his cold, icy breast, where a heart ought to have been, he nursed his selfish, sinister intentions—calculating in his marriages, in his contracts, in his government, in everything save his sombre religion.

In respect to kindness of spirit, Charles appears to us to have caught something of the temper of his unfeeling son, when he went aside to a cloister. He became less noble as he became more secluded; and his bigotry was inflamed to an unwonted degree, just in proportion to his estrangement from society, and the gloominess of his reflections in the solitudes of the mountains.

Now, prejudicing the Lowlands at the very outset of his career by this want of amenity—offending them still more by his arbitrary demands in the use of power—Philip paved the way to a settled and growing dislike, which was ready at any time to break out into an explosion. Still farther than this, braced up as he was in the iron-bound intolerance of a religious inquisitor, he provoked a revolution in one part of his empire, and exanimated another by his fiery persecutions. It has been well said by Mr. Prescott, that the key to Philip's character was his zeal for the Papacy. That he had in addition, as the historian intimates, a love of irresponsible and absolute rule, cannot be questioned for a moment. He was never willing to submit to dictation. No appeal would he tolerate—hardly a respectable conference. He could not abide the Netherlands because of their sentiment of freedom, their corporate rights, and their States General—all of which in time he meant to extinguish. Unlike to Charles, in whom ambition no doubt was the master passion, Philip bowed to the yoke of a more tyrannical frenzy, in the shape of a crusading and deadly hate of the heretic. Charles would not have spared even the pontiff himself, had he stood in his way. He was sincere in his faith, but he was yet more earnest in extending his government. His strife with Protestantism was provoked quite as much by its tendency to political as to ecclesiastical evil; and, when shut up in Estramadura, he perceived how the cause of the Reformed confederates was threatening the integrity of the Germanic States, it was, we believe, even more for this reason, than for all others put together, that he regretted his "safe conduct" to Luther, at Worms. Philip, on the other hand, would rather forfeit his sceptre, than reign over enemies to the Church of Rome. When, contrary to every principle of right and justice, with intrigue and insult added to injury, Pope Paul the Fourth made war on the possessions of Philip in Italy, the latter, though firm in resisting aggression—though he drove back the pontiff, or rather his allies, to the very banks of the Tiber, and might have taken him captive in the seven hilled city—he yet forbore his advantage—stooped to the humiliation of accepting terms from the conquered—asked pardon for intrusion—and even consented through his general to receive words of absolution from the offending prelate, for having lifted up his hand against him. The ex-sovereign, at Yuste, was restless and impatient at this forbearance of Philip with such a lordly rebel; but his successor at Madrid looked through the political disturber in Pope Paul the Fourth, to his spiritual head.

Now the forces of France had been called into this struggle to abet the ends of the rebellious pontiff; and albeit it was at the solicitation of the latter, yet the former were held accountable by the Court of Spain for breaking the solemn covenant of a five years' truce. We behold therefore the armies of the indignant victor marched into the territory of his faithless rival to punish this perfidy. The Duke of Savoy, and Lamoral, Count of Egmont, unite their solid columns on the plains of Picardy, about St. Quentin. The flower of French chivalry is shortly routed before them, and the veteran Montmorency is taken prisoner. The well-guarded fortress, after a gallant defense, is stormed and razed—inflicting a wound upon the proud honor of France such as she had not received “since the battle of Agincourt.” As illustrating the character of Philip the Second, we introduce an extract from the pages before us, which very nicely discriminates in one important respect between the father and son.

“When Charles the Fifth received tidings of the victory of St. Quentin, the first thing he asked, as we are told, was, whether Philip were at Paris? Had Charles been in command, he would doubtless have followed up the blow by presenting himself at once before the French capital. But Philip was not of that sanguine temper which overlooks, or at least overleaps, the obstacles in its way. Charles calculated the chances of success: Philip those of failure. Charles' character opened the way to more brilliant achievements, but exposed him also to severer reverses. His enterprising spirit was more favorable to building up a great empire; the cautious temper of Philip was better fitted to preserve it. Philip came in the right time; and his circumspect policy was probably better suited to his position, as well as to his character, than the bolder policy of the Emperor.” Vol. I. p. 240.

In less than four months after this memorable triumph, we find the Duke of Guise attacking and capturing the strong hold of Calais. A second descent on the lilies of France is undertaken by Philip; in the progress of which the hired soldiers of Henry, while attempting a retreat along the shores of the Channel, are fallen upon by Egmont and cut effectually to pieces—the guns of an English squadron which was coursing near the banks raking them from the sea.

Both the Spanish and French Monarchs now took the field in person, after this battle of Gravelines. What but prudence and fear—the hazard of losing all on a single throw of the die—kept the latter from advancing, and what but habitual caution put a restraint upon the former? As the historian remarks,

had the fathers of these princes been in the place of their sons they would doubtless have crossed swords before they parted ; one or the other would have led his forces to victory. The dauntless Austrian blood would have followed up its opportunity with the impetuosity of lightning. Its vehemence and determination might have outrode its judgment. But the cooler Castilian which flowed in Philip was slow and considerate, calculating the chances of disastrous defeat, fitted for the cabinet rather than the scene of combat—and prone to winding its way in the train of events, rather, than attempting to furrow channels for itself, by shaping circumstances to suit its pleasure. The consequence was, that the two armies were separated, and a treaty was entered into at Cateau Cambresis in the course of the following year.

Still it is not to be concealed that one of the causes of this pacific disposition was the financial embarrassment pressing heavily on the treasuries of both the kingdoms ; and a still weightier circumstance, which turned the scale, was the alarming spread of the Protestant religion. Henry the Second was as anxious almost to crush the rising reformation, as was Philip the Second, but he had less of power. France had proved quite a productive soil for the reformed doctrines ; but while Catherine de Medici, who soon ruled its destinies, was intent upon furthering her own aggrandizement, and Ferdinand the Emperor across the Rhine pursued, for the most part, a lenient policy, it was reserved to Philip—qualified for the task both by position and character—to stand forth as the champion of the chair of Peter, and to wage unyielding warfare against the heretic. We propose to narrow down our range of discussion to a notice of the history of this extraordinary conflict, in what remains of the present review.

Now to appreciate the sentiment of a bigoted Romanist three centuries since, when he saw the agitation of the pontifical sea caused by the stir of some internal commotion, which threatened to involve it in a general storm, we must remember that that sea was as hallowed in his eyes, as the waves which were once pressed by our Saviour's feet in Galilee—that it reflected to his view all that he knew of Heaven—that there was no religion, as he thought, which had not bathed in its waters—that to purify it from some of the human admixtures which had been thrown into its bosom, might be well, but the attempt must proceed from its own central spring—while to inveigh against that, to charge to its visible head the very abominations deplored and condemned was high-handed impiety against Christ and against God. The ignorant zealot

who saw the agitation of which we have spoken, had no doubt that it proceeded from the very gates of hell, opened up into the vasty deep. And the ambitious ruler who had been used to riding on that sea to power, who had found that in alliance with the papal throne had been his strength, felt called upon not only by his Christian faith, but by despotic principles, to oppose the rising of this seditious movement.

Philip the Second loved absolute principles, but he feared "heresy" more. He had received his birth and education in a land which had stormed with persecuting zeal against the un-Christian for more than eight centuries. Extermination of error was the war cry of the Spaniard, from the first invasion of the Saracen. Christendom owes very much to the indignant rage of the Peninsula against the triumphs of the crescent. In western Europe and in eastern not forgetting the Hungarian struggles she was the staunchest defender of the cross. No one can say what would have been the religion of the continent in the sixteenth century, had the followers of the Prophet been opposed by a less resolute arm or by a power less effective than that of the monarchs of Spain.

Almost crushed in the seventh century, crowded by her invaders into the narrow quarters of Biscay, and Asturia on the north—her Visigoth leaders there rallying their strength, and recrossing the sierras which had walled them in like a bulwark steadily, though with slow and fluctuating success, recovered her territory—contested at every point with almost resistless valor—until they saw once more the broken ranks of Islam robbed of their usurped dominion, save in the kingdom of Granada. Ferdinand the Catholic and his fair queen of Portugal were not long in reducing this remaining province. When the Church became dominant, both Moslems and Hebrews, partly from fear and sometimes from conviction, flocked in great numbers to the side of the victors—espousing the faith. Defections from time to time took place in their ranks, and secret adherence to the creed of their fathers was practiced by many who hypocritically professed to be converts to Christ. It was at this precise juncture that Isabella and Ferdinand, under the advice of Mendoza, Archbishop of Seville, introduced the Inquisition which for nearly three centuries had existed in Europe with very qualified powers. Now it was brought to bear with all its effective discipline, and all its uncompromising cruelty against apostates. Taking a wider range, it assumed the work of conversion, and became at once a political engine, as well as a religious. This Institution was revived by Pope Paul the Fourth, under Philip the Second. The Spaniards who had

formerly resisted its introduction had become used by degrees to its terrible espionage, from which none were safe; and having gradually lost even the forms of freedom under Charles the Emperor, who had suppressed their Cortes, and being inclined constitutionally no less than by custom to war for the Church, gave it their quiet and cordial countenance.

The advance of the Reformation into the Spanish dominions had been effected for the most part through the soldiers of Charles who had served in the Lowlands, and who carried home to the peninsula something of the doctrines which they had learned of their associates. But it was not the soldiers alone who had imported these novelties. Many scholars of Spain had been educated in Germany, and many savans and courtiers who followed in the train of the warlike emperor had become inoculated with Lutheranism. Men of intelligence and piety upon their return from middle Europe, took pains to disseminate the truths they had received through secret societies. A version of the Bible was printed in Castilian at one of the presses of Germany. Various Protestant publications, some of them originating among the Spaniards themselves, were privately circulated. Particularly in Aragon, which, from its proximity to France, held easy communication with the race of the Huguenots, and in Seville and Valladolid, the principles of the Reformers made considerable progress. And the extent of their diffusion may be judged of from the fact, that when a simultaneous descent, in all parts of the kingdom, was concerted by Valdez and his numerous minions, on the unsuspecting victims of their heartless cruelty, the chambers of the Tribunal, the common prisons, the convents, and even private dwellings forced into the service, were found wholly inadequate to receive the quarry.

No rank, however high, and no class, however tender, were spared the ordeal. Spain's ripest classical scholar of the day, her most eloquent preacher, and her most able historian, were haled, we are told, with other ornaments of the realm before the awful tribunal. Many pious Dominicans were committed on suspicion; Cazella, the favorite chaplain of Charles, perished in the flames. No less than nine bishops of the Roman Catholic communion were compelled to humiliating penances for heterodoxy in opinion. Bartolomé Carranza, archbishop of Toledo, partly for his moderate and enlightened views of the Church after the school of Contarini, Pole and others, and more particularly for jealousy at his rare success and his large emoluments, was seized by the Grand Inquisitor, worried out by confinement, and after eighteen years of suspense and wrong was respited by

the Pope, only to die of his sufferings. It is not needful to recount the confiscations and banishments, the slow processes of torture, the life-long captivities and mortifying endurances, with which the reconciled to Rome escaped the garotte or the fagot. Nor is it, above all, important to describe the inhuman "autos de fe" with which the proceedings of the Inquisition were solemnly and finally closed. These mockeries of religion are held up by Mr. Prescott to the execration they deserve—who has depicted them to us with the hand of a master.

But what was the effect of this exterminating strife? The cause of the Reformation was plucked up by the roots, and has never since taken effect upon the soil of Spain. A few independent enquirers may have been left in its cloisters, who never dared to avow themselves; and down to this present, it is only here and there that some earnest Dominican or friar of St. Francis calls into question the corruptions of Rome, remaining, however, in his sacred order because there is no other alternative. The memoirs of Blanco White furnish an illustration of the working of this leaven among the ranks of the clergy.

But was the effect of persecution confined to the Church? Did it not extend itself into the department of State, and even to the world of letters? If the reign of Philip and his father before him were the culminating era in the renown of Spain, the times which followed saw her gradually decline from a commanding eminence to a low political stature among the nations. "The fall of Granada had given the first impulse to her creative genius, and the stirring times of Charles brought out a rapid development." There was the old Castilian, the Provençal admixture, and lastly, the Arabic element—full of chivalry and love of country—which were fused at length into a distinguishingly national and brilliant muse. Shortly after Philip's days the poets became less Spanish; on account of surveillance, writers wrote with caution, save in a few rare exceptions; thought became restrained, enquiry hampered, the range of study contracted, politics and theology were barred subjects to the people, science never thrived, and character died slowly out. "Folded under the dark wing of the Inquisition," are the eloquent words of Mr. Prescott, "Spain was shut out from the light which in the sixteenth century broke over the rest of Europe, stimulating the nations to greater enterprise in every department of knowledge. The genius of the people was rebuked, and their spirit quenched under the malignant influence of an eye that never slumbered, of an unseen arm ever raised to strike. How could there be freedom of thought, where there was no freedom

of utterance? Or freedom of utterance, where it was as dangerous to say too little as too much? Freedom cannot go along with fear. Every way the mind of the Spaniard was in fetters. His moral sense was miserably perverted. Men were judged, not by their practice, but by their professions. Creed became a substitute for conduct. Difference of faith made a wider gulf of separation than difference of race, language, or even interest. Spain no longer formed one of the great brotherhood of Christian nations. An immeasurable barrier was raised between that kingdom and the Protestant states of Europe. The early condition of perpetual warfare with the Arabs who overran the country, had led the Spaniards to mingle religion strangely with their politics. The effect continued when the cause had ceased. Their wars with the European nations became religious wars. In fighting England or the Netherlands, they were fighting the enemies of God. Their wars took the character of a perpetual crusade, and were conducted with all the ferocity which fanaticism could inspire.

"The same dark spirit of fanaticism seems to brood over the national literature; even that lighter literature which in other nations is made up of the festive sallies of wit, or the tender expression of sentiment. The greatest geniuses of the nation, the masters of the drama and the ode, while they astonish us by their miracles of invention, show that they have too often kindled their inspiration at the altars of the Inquisition.

"Debarred as he was from freedom of speculation, the domain of science was closed against the Spaniard. Science looks to perpetual change. It turns to the past to gather warning as well as instruction, for the future. Its province is to remove old abuses, to explode old errors, to unfold new truths. Its condition, in short, is that of progress. But in Spain everything not only looked to the past, but rested on the past. Old abuses gathered respect from their antiquity. Reform was innovation, and innovation was a crime. Far from progress, all was stationary. The hand of the Inquisition drew the line which said, 'No further!' This was the limit of human intelligence in Spain. The effect was visible in every department of science—not in the speculative alone, but in the physical and the practical; in the declamatory rant of its theology and ethics, in the childish and chimerical schemes of its political economists. In every walk were to be seen the symptoms of premature decrepitude, as the nation clung to the antiquated system which the march of civilization in other countries had long since effaced. Hence those frantic experiments, so often repeated, in the financial administration of the kingdom,

which made Spain the by-word of the nations, and which ended in the ruin of trade, the prostration of credit, and finally the bankruptcy of the state." Vol. I, pp. 446-8.

From this Sahara of the Papacy, we now turn our attention to the blighted prospects of another part of the heritage which fell to the scepter of Philip the Second. In changing our field of vision from southern to middle Europe, we are to remember that we leave the most romantic and chivalrous of all the lands of song for an intelligent, thrifty, adventurous people, stretching their peaceful enterprise to the most distant countries. Flanders and Holland led the way in productive and useful industry in the Sixteenth Century. Their manufactures were more extensive, their cities more populous, their merchants more successful than any others in Europe, while the comforts of life and even its elegancies were widely distributed. Antwerp was the banking house of all the nations. Education and learning kept pace with wealth. Scarcely an inhabitant was to be found throughout their territory who could not read and write, and this at a period when public systems of education were quite unknown. The people were distinguished for a general love of liberty. The States of the Netherlands were virtually republics, independent and distinct, having their own legislatures, courts of justice and rulers; acknowledging, indeed, a supreme court of appeal in their associate capacity, and a body called the States General, in which they were severally represented; which body, however, had no power to make laws, neither to vote supplies, nor enter into contracts, but only to counsel and recommend to the provinces.

When Philip the Second took the government of the Lowlands, he was not a little annoyed by the free speech and demeanor of his Flemish dependents. He stayed but a short time at Brussels, the seat of his Court, and committed the care of the country to his half sister, Margaret, the Duchess of Parma. She was to be assisted by two Councils, consisting of noblemen, who should concur in her movements; in addition to whom, a select body of three, called "the Consulta," was to be her common resort. Granvelle, bishop of Arras, Viglius, a jurist, and Count Barlaimont, made up the Consulta. Beyond these persons she seldom looked for advice.

The Reformation in Flanders was so identified in its growth with a Civil Revolution, that it is hardly possible to do justice to its progress, without describing its adjunct. The Flemings were ill at ease with the conduct of Philip from the very commencement of his reign; first, because of his appointment of foreign vicegerents to the chief offices under him,

and secondly, for his quartering an army of soldiers upon them in a season of peace. Of the former, perhaps, they had less reason to complain, as it was only a reversing of the course pursued by his father; but with the latter they were more justly offended, because the object was to enforce the sanguinary edicts which had been published by Charles against the Reformed Religion. We shall not stop to show how the seeds of the Reformation had been scattered over the Netherlands, lying on the middle ground, as they did between Wittemberg and Geneva, and the Cross of St. Paul. It was impossible that so inquisitive and social a people should have remained insensible to the wide-spread controversy. The doctrines of Luther, and in some measure, of Calvin, had awakened a general interest amongst the population. The Protestant standard found them zealous adherents. The people as a class, that is, the more thoughtful, entered cordially into it. Their affections, their tastes, their convictions, their principles, sided with Protestantism—as those of the Spaniards sided with Papacy. Hence, the edicts of Charles could never be enforced. In some provinces like Brabant, they were never attempted to be executed, while in most, they were suffered to become almost quiescent. But now Philip would revive them. The Inquisition proper he would establish in Flanders, such as he had erected at home; and the people taking fire at the thought, kindled into a flame of active opposition. In connection with this, he sought to introduce fourteen new bishoprics into the territory of the Flemings, to whose support should be diverted the revenues of the abbey, henceforth to be subjected not to priors but to prelates. The civil dignitaries were displeased, because the already mighty power lodged in the hands of the king would be swollen by this; and the common subjects took offense, because it would assist the Inquisition.

Disregarding however, both the nobles and the people, the king pursued his measures. The consequence was an incipient rebellion. Some of the provinces refused altogether to admit their bishops—all condemned the edicts. William, the Prince of Orange, who had stood high in the favor of Charles the Fifth, and Lamoral, Count of Egmont, the hero of the battle of Gravelines, were members of the Council of State, who protested with their associates against these steps. Their ground was not an ecclesiastical one, for Egmont was a papist, and Orange, at this time, was by no means a protestant. It was simply for the reason that the measures were impolitic. They would foment disorder—they would increase apprehension, which already existed to such a degree as to lead hundreds to

emigrate—thus crippling the resources, and transferring the industry and talent of the people to neighboring countries. The truth is, the Romanists, hardly less than the Reformers, were opposed to the establishment of the Spanish Inquisition. All classes alike were jealous for the liberties of their ancient dominion.

The patriotic leaders preferred now a complaint to their lawful sovereign, that many acts were ratified by the "Consulta" of the realm, without their concurrence, for which they themselves were held responsible by the people. Their opinions, they averred, were so little regarded, that the Regent and her ministers did not wait to receive them. A misunderstanding in consequence sprung up between Granvelle and the order of the nobles. They petition for a calling of the States General together. Forbidden to do this, by direction of the king, Margaret reluctantly accedes to a Convention of the knights of the Golden Fleece—who appoint the Baron Montigny to visit Madrid, and lay before his Majesty the deplorable state of affairs. Montigny accepts his mission. Philip recommends to the Regent to cajole Count Egmont and the Prince of Orange by flattering words; or to divide their councils by exciting mutual jealousy. Granvelle becomes daily more and more the object of general hate. The whole influence of the country is solemnly banded against him, till Margaret at length abandons his cause, and the king acquiesces in his retirement from the cabinet. In the meanwhile, through the conflict of the "Consulta" and the nobles, and the fluctuation of the Regent, the edicts are not put in force, and the cause of the Reformation consequently makes rapid strides onward. Many return from their exile, hoping to escape farther trouble. The officers of justice are openly defied by the people, and prisoners are released by violence who had been condemned to suffer. When the Tridentine Decrees were directed to be published and established in the Netherlands, the Roman Catholic clergy, no less than the laity, objected to the measure as a ruthless invasion of their wonted privileges.

A second deputation from the Council of State is accordingly sent to Madrid, in the person of Egmont, to set forth again existing grievances. The Count is graciously received, and dismissed with promises. His report on his return gives general joy to the people—and to all persons indeed, save to the Prince of Orange, who does not credit his sovereign. Very shortly the worst fears of the Prince of Orange are realized. The procrastinating Philip, ever intent upon his objects, but still disposed to put off their execution—after deceiving the Count,

and deferring the Regent with pledges, announces at Brussels that his edicts must be pressed—that they shall no longer be slighted—and that the persecution of Anabaptists shall be carried on relentlessly. In the very teeth of remonstrances, both from Margaret and the Councils, he refuses to summon the States General together. Sedition becomes rife. The people are ready for war. Placards, lampoons, satirical sallies, are hurled at the throne and the Church. Among the lower ranks of the nobility, a league is formed and entered into, and the famous Compromise is drafted. At the head of this party are Count Louis of Nassau, brother of William of Orange who did not join in the compact, and the more prominent, but less important, Viscount of Brederode. Margaret is smitten with terror. The noble Prince, remarkable up to this time for the temperateness of his policy, and his loyalty to the government, is anxious to bring about a constitutional reform by constitutional measures.

As the fermentation goes on, the malcontents grow stronger, and some of them are for claiming entire liberty in religion, and some even for disavowance from the crown of Spain. A petition is drawn up under the sanction of William, which is addressed to the Regent, and is presented by a deputation of four hundred brave delegates from the celebrated League, who proceed with it in a body to the Court at Brussels. Margaret, at a loss how to understand this petition, thus formidably conveyed, and not a little alarmed, promises to use her influence with her brother of Spain to satisfy their request, and announces that with the advice of the Council of State, and the Knights of the Fleece, she had prepared a scheme for the moderation of the rigor of the imperial edicts. As the confederates withdraw from her presence, led on by Brederode, Barlaimont, with a view to quieting the Regent's fears, observes that "they are nothing but a company of beggars," when the taunt is caught up, and "*Gueux*" henceforth becomes their boasted distinction.

The marquis of Bergen and the baron de Montigny are sent with fresh dispatches from Brussels to Madrid. Margaret's plan of moderation does not satisfy the provinces. The people increase their clamor. In the delay of Philip to reply to the missives, field preaching and street preaching become daily more common under the very eye of the authorities. The ever memorable meeting at St. Trond is held. The confederates again renew their demands in far bolder terms—asking not only redress of grievances, but even for toleration of every form of religion, of whatever shade or name. A few R. C.

members now abandon the League, not being willing to go to this unthoughtof extent. Actual preparations for conflict begin to be made by the insurgents. Margaret writes in imploring terms to her brother to hasten to Flanders, or to convoke the States General, as rebellion is certain. Philip at length makes a reluctant agreement—insincere as it proves, and so avowed in secret even at the time—to abolish the Inquisition, and to extend a general amnesty to all, with one single exception, whom his sister should pardon; it being understood that the League should be abandoned from this day forward. Yet to summon the States General he will not consent—while the conditions are such of his royal allowances, that they fail to conciliate the people, though they trouble his own conscience for their overmuch clemency.

Is it not easy to see that the breach between the king and the inhabitants of the Lowlands, is widening continually? The party of the Reformers, in distinction from the Confederates with whom they were united, gather fresh courage at this time, and push forward to the commission of a series of outrages, which, almost hopelessly, throw back the advancing cause. Iconoclasm from their ranks, breaks boldly into churches and despoils their altars; images, pictures, decorations, architecture, are all wantonly invaded and irretrievably ruined. No resistance is attempted. The civil arm seems powerless. The Regent, in a panic, determines on fleeing from her palace—from which she is dissuaded, yea, forcibly restrained. She again renews her concessions, and her offers of amnesty to the revolting body; on condition of which, the confederates agree to break up their league, and to aid her government in suppressing the disorder. They disband in consequence, and set about their engagement. First, the Prince of Orange restores quiet to Antwerp, of which he was burgrave, by punishing the leaders of sedition, and by conceding to the Protestants—much to the displeasure of Margaret—six of the ancient churches for holding their own services in, while the remainder are restored to their former proprietors. For this he is censured, no less by the Protestants than by the Regent herself, though for a very different reason. Mutual distrust grows up from this day onward, between Margaret and William. The *political* party proceeding through the country, loses the confidence of the people who are in favor of the Reformation; while the Roman Catholic portion becomes estranged from the latter on account of their sacrilege. The Calvinists and the Lutherans are at war too, with one another, for differences of belief, and will not coalesce. Thus the strength of the opposition is temporarily

broken down. Margaret is able to recover her authority, and to tighten the reins of her government. Egmont and Hoorne take their seats again in her cabinet; but Orange is too sagacious to do so. With the returning power of the Regent, fresh rumors from abroad of the terrible designs of Philip, reach the ear of the country, which lead to fresh determinations to resist his oppression. Protestant princes in Germany, and even the Emperor Ferdinand, interest themselves to dissuade Philip from violence. Margaret retracts her concessions to the Protestant teachers, not allowing them to perform their clerical duties. She calls in the aid of military force, and attempts to introduce garrisons into the principal cities for overcoming her enemies. Valenciennes resists, and stoutly closes her gates during a four months' siege. Antwerp is in a ferment, and but for her noble burgrave, would be given over to destruction. The country around rises up in arms, though it soon lays them quietly down again.

Margaret now exacting a new oath of allegiance—unconditional and absolute—Orange refuses to take it, and abandons the kingdom. Louis of Nassau, Hoogstraten, Culemborg and many others, follow his example. Counts Egmont and Hoorne, though the former especially is affectionately warned by the prince, submit to the test, and vainly hope to reinstate themselves by greater zeal for their sovereign.

It would seem now to have been enough for the satisfaction of the king that order was reestablished, and that the Papal authority was generally acknowledged. But no; the bigoted and revengeful mind of Philip could not be satisfied until he had thoroughly punished the recent malcontents, and had destroyed in the Lowlands the last seeds of the Reformation. Accordingly, he determined to send Alva to the Netherlands as his plenipotentiary. Hard-hearted as was Philip, he was yet exceeded in fierceness, and coldness, and treachery by this iron-mailed warrior. Alva, with an army speedily mustered for the purpose, started on his journey,

"Impiger, iracundus, inexorabilis, acer,"

impatient to lay his hand on the necks of the heretics. Passing through the borders of France, he was urged, on his journey, to turn aside for a moment to deal a deathblow at the Calvinists—the growing faction in the neighborhood under Coligni and Conde. But he resists the temptation. Arrived in the Netherlands, he announces his commission to act independently of any local authority. The Regent is justly incensed. Her power is soon superseded; she resigns in disgust, and retires from the kingdom, and Alva takes her command. The Inquisition is set up in all its odiousness and horror. Setting aside the jurisdiction

of the established courts of the realm, the Council of Blood is appointed for the trial of offenders, and crowds of victims are brought daily before it—who without the shadow of a hearing are summarily condemned to loss of life and possessions. So atrocious is the outrage offered to law and equity, that many of the Council resign, and two only of their number, are left to perform its work. Confiscations, banishments, tortures, deaths, are everywhere decreed. William of Orange, in his remote German home, is appealed to by his countrymen to interfere in their behalf. He raises a small army, which advances to the rescue, but which, for want of perfect concert between its two divisions, is cut off and routed. Among the arrests that are made under the civil authority, two of the most important are the oft-named Count Egmont and his associate Hoorne. Never forgiven—notwithstanding their services both before and afterwards—for their concern with the League which had so threatened the government, they are secretly made prisoners, and thrown into a fortress, from which they come forth only to die. The treachery, inhumanity, injustice and violence exercised by Alva, with the countenance of his master upon these unfortunate nobles, exceed our belief. The historian of Philip recounts with a painful fidelity, the incidents of their trial and eventual punishment. The whole narrative, indeed, of the outbreak in the Netherlands, with its causes and apologies, is nowhere more truthfully brought to the view of the reader than in the present publication.

In vain did those knights appeal to the rights of their order as members of the “*Toison d’or*,” to be tried by their peers. In vain did their counsel ask for a delay of the sentence, in order to produce their witnesses. In vain did a judge learned on the bench declare that the whole proceeding was wrong, illegal in form as well as in spirit. To no purpose did the hero of the battle of Gravelines and the siege of St. Quentin, remind his sovereign of the honor he had done him as a soldier in the field—of his loyalty always, even when resisting his edicts—of his soundness as a papist and of his recent activity in suppressing rebellion and reëstablishing order;—he was not to be spared; but for an example to others as well as for retributive justice, he was to expiate his sins by forfeiting his life on the block.

Thus perished Count Egmont, the pride of his countrymen, the chivalrous, generous, magnificent courtier, the warm-hearted civilian, the lover of the Netherlands. Too susceptible to flattery and too much at heart a loyalist, he could not think of utter separation from his king; a Romanist too, and as such, an enemy to reformation, he was jostled often in his place, in attempting to carry out his views as a patriot;—he was tossed

from side to side, till at length the meshes which were artfully spread for him had entangled his feet, and he could not effect his escape. The cold blooded premeditation with which Alva and Philip laid their snare in his path, and finally inveigled him into it, is one of the blackest pictures of human depravity.

But while Egmont and Hoorne thus suffered in the Lowlands, another victim of deception, the Baron De Montigny, who, it will be remembered, was the bearer of despatches with Bergen from the Council of State to Madrid, was ensnared and confined. For month after month he had been prevented by Philip from returning with his associate to their home in the north. De Bergen in the meanwhile died of his sufferings, and Montigny was sacrificed to the spleen of the monarch. His estates were confiscated, as well as those of his friend, to enrich the royal exchequer.

Can we doubt, that the man who would thus deal with his nobles on mere suspicion of heresy or of countenancing heresy, would hesitate for a moment to take the life of his son? The fate of Don Carlos has formed the subject of romance, and of many a dark conjecture. It is wrapped still in mystery; but yet, from the light let in upon it by Mr. Prescott through Philip's letters and missives, we can scarcely avoid the persuasion that his death is to be accounted for by his Lowland sympathies. He was suspected of heresy and of estrangement from his parent. He would hardly have been doomed to die for insanity. His was a fate, as we are almost forced to believe, like Egmont's and Hoorne's, and Montigny's and Bergen's—like that of the Prince of Orange yet later, and of Escovedo his secretary.

It is to the honor of Mr. Prescott, that while he presents all the details in the conduct of Philip, with their aggravating accompaniments, he yet yields him the chances of a charitable verdict. The historian is called upon to furnish a candid exhibition without partisan prejudices or foregone conclusions. His impartiality and fairness do him great credit; while his accuracy of information secure him the confidence of the reader.

We should have been glad to notice the probable influence of Philip upon the Reformation in England, through his marriage with Mary; but our limits forbid. We cannot but remark, however, that there was a hand of Providence which early severed his connection with the English throne; and though we are confident that the Anglo Saxon faith, like that of the inhabitants of Holland and Flanders, would have been

strengthened by a conflict with his oppressive rule, yet it would have been doubtless through fires of martyrdom or seas of blood, that it at last prevailed.

In the volumes before us there are passages of great beauty and truth which it would have been well for the reviewer to transfer to his pages for their intrinsic merit.

The account of the abdication of Charles the First, the sad fate of Italy in the sixteenth century, Philip's marriage festivities, the death of Isabella and kindred descriptions, are among the most graphic of the historical pen. The brilliant episode upon the Ottoman struggle and the brave knights of Malta is fraught with the interest of late Crimean despatches. For fulness of research, for selection and arrangement, for variety of subject, for nice analysis of character and thorough discussion of affairs, for picturesqueness, distinctness and vigor of effect—the *History of Philip the Second* leaves us nothing to desire. We shall look with eagerness for the continuation of its narrative from the gifted hand of its author, through the enterprising house which now offers it to the public. On its fair and beautiful pages the eye rests with pleasure, and on its typographical correctness. We cannot forget, as we here suspend our discussion, that the master-spirit of the Netherlands is looking from his exile, like the mountain eagle from his aerie, across the scene of carnage—moulting the tenets of his religious indifference—and repluming his pinions for a more lofty flight, with the study of Protestantism and the free principles of the Gospel.

ART. III.—THE CHURCH OF THE NEW TESTAMENT.

1. *The Kingdom of Christ, delineated in two Essays, on our Lord's own account of His Person, and of the Nature of His Kingdom, and of the Constitution, Powers, and Ministry of a Christian Church, as appointed by Himself.* By RICHARD WHATELY, D. D., Archbishop of Dublin. New York: Wiley & Putnam. 1843.
2. *The Primary Charge, delivered before the Convention, &c., of South Carolina.* By the Rt. Rev. THOS. F. DAVIS, D. D., Bishop of the Diocese. Charleston. 1856.
3. *The Church in its Idea, Attributes and Ministry: with a particular reference to the Controversy on the subject between the Romanists and Protestants.* By EDWARD ARTHUR LITTON, M. A., Perpetual Curate of Stockton Heath, Cheshire, and late Fellow of Oriel College, Oxford. London, 1851. 8vo., pp. 707.

RECENT discussions within our own branch of the Church, serve at least to show that we are not yet done with a question, which, we hoped, was long since put at rest. For this question does not at all stop in its relations to the Nature, Organization, Ministry, and Sacraments of the Church of Christ. It concerns equally, all the Doctrines of the New Testament, and the very fact of the Inspiration of God's Revealed Word. No man, who has an eye upon the drifting of popular sentiment in England and the United States, can fail to see, to what issues, fearful issues, this whole question finally must come. This method of argumentation has never been more plausibly exhibited than in the work of Archbishop Whately named above; and we have therefore selected that form of the question, for the purpose of examining it in one or two only of its bearings; to which examination we now invite the attention of the reader.

There are two theories regarding the Kingdom of Christ on earth, into which nearly all opinions on the subject may be resolved. The first may be thus stated. Our Redeemer, before His reascension into Heaven, authorized the formation of a society, to be composed of members professing a belief in His Messiahship; He appointed the first officers of the society, and prescribed the mode of admission into membership; furthermore, He promised that whatever rules of organization and

discipline should be subsequently adopted by the original officers should be divinely ratified, and cheered them with the assurance that He would be with them and their successors to the end of the world. The sacred historians of the life of Christ have given us, each of them, a portion of the Charter under which the Christian society was incorporated; and when we have gathered up the fragments that remain, it will run thus. "And I say also unto thee, thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my Church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it; and I will give unto thee the keys of the Kingdom of Heaven, and whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth, shall be bound in Heaven, and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth shall be loosed in Heaven. Verily, I say unto you, whatsoever Ye shall bind on earth shall be bound in Heaven, &c. Go ye into all the world, and preach the Gospel to every creature; he that believeth and is baptized shall be saved, but he that believeth not shall be damned. Peace be unto you; as My Father hath sent Me, even so send I you; and when He had said this, He breathed on them, and said, receive ye the Holy Ghost, whosoever sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them, and whosoever sins ye retain, they are retained. All power is given unto Me in Heaven and on earth; go ye, therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Ghost; teaching them to observe all things, whatsoever I have commanded you, and lo I am with you always, even unto the end of the world. Amen. But ye shall receive power, after that the Holy Ghost is come upon you, and ye shall be witnesses unto Me, both in Jerusalem and in all Judea, and in Samaria, and unto the uttermost part of the earth."

Now two things are observable in this Charter. First, that the clause which confers the right of ruling or governing the society was, in the first instance, given to one individual officer, and afterwards to the Twelve conjointly; from which it is inferred that the decision of the Twelve collectively, was not essential to the validity of every rule or law of the Church, but that as one passage of the Charter required them to preach to every creature, and thus necessitated a separation of the Twelve, the one from the other, so another clause authorized each of them to rule and govern, with sole authority, in that portion of the world which he should evangelize; and hence, again, is inferred the principle of Episcopacy.

Another point worthy of notice is this: that the Charter does not declare how a succession of officers was to be maintained, although the last clause plainly guarantees that succession.

For the mode, then, by which the succession was preserved, we must refer to the acts and writings of the Apostles; and there it is ascertained that the Apostles ordained their own successors, as Titus and Timothy: second, Presbyters in subordination to Apostles; third, Deacons the lowest grade of officers. It is contended for, that the method of perpetuating officers, established by the Apostles, has been strictly preserved in all ages; that the society itself, its Charter and Ministers, still exist, in discipline and faith as the Apostles at the first arranged them, with this exception, that in the Apostolic age, the society comprised all Christians; but in the present day, a portion only of believers is included in the Church. It is urged, also, that Christians not in communion with the Church, are not free from the guilt of schism. This is one view of Christ's Kingdom, and persons who adopt it, believe themselves to be warranted by Scripture and the History of the Church.

The other view of the Nature of Christ's kingdom differs essentially from the foregoing. Our Saviour, it is said, gave this authoritative sanction to the establishment of a Christian community; and consequently to everything included in the idea of a community, viz: Organization, By-Laws, Officers; therefore, that the Ministers of the Church derive their authority not from any commission received by them from Christ, through the medium of the Apostles and their successors, but from the fact, that they are the regularly appointed functionaries of a *Society* organized on Gospel principles; and that every Christian association, which is orthodox in fundamentals, is stamped with the approval of Heaven, and its officers commissioned by Christ, inasmuch as He authorized the formation of a community, and a community *must* have some Officials for its government.

Dr. Whately is the most powerful expositor of this theory in modern times; and in his "Kingdom of Christ" has skillfully urged the strongest arguments that can be pleaded in its favor. We purpose then to make some remarks on those arguments; and shall endeavor to show that they are erroneous in principle, and must lead to extreme perplexity, though they are adduced for the purpose of simplifying our notions of Church Government. In the present day, when the advantages of organization and the formation of societies are so well understood and so extremely popular, any argument by which the theory of Christ's Church could be brought down to the level of human associations, must recommend itself generally, and becomes plausible in proportion as it is based on "common sense principles." It is therefore certainly to combat popular prejudice to attempt

a refutation of the theory which rests the whole structure of Church Government, on the fact that our Lord directed the establishment of a Community, and by so doing, sanctioned all "the institutions which belong to the essence of a Community."

This theory, again, has much liberality to recommend it. All Christian Associations are thereby equalized in privileges, because it is idle to insert a saving clause, such as "orthodox in fundamentals," in order to restrict the Divine ratification of Christian societies within some limits. One society will differ from another in estimating the fundamentals of religion, and all societies are satisfied that they are fundamentally orthodox. It is then very satisfactory to be able to approve of a system of interpretation which accommodates all the varieties of Christian organization, not with one another, but with Christ's intention regarding that organization. But we suspect that, however in accordance with common sense principles the system may be, yet that it will be utterly impossible to establish it from Scripture.

Assuming, then, that our Lord's expression to the Apostles, respecting "binding and loosing,"* meant that He gave to them and the succeeding officers of a Christian Church, the power to make regulations for the management of the community, we argue that He did *not* authorize the community *to organize itself*. Nothing can be clearer than that He promised the Divine ratification to that constitution and government only, which the Apostles should adopt. Not a word of sanction is given to laws or rules made by others. The first twelve officers of the Church received authority to legislate for the Church: they did legislate and adopt a method of perpetuating legislators and officers. Let us ascertain what that method was, and we have one Divinely ratified.

Where is it to be found?—for found it must be. In the writings and acts of the Apostles. It is admitted on all hands that the first officers of the Church did not derive their position, their powers, or rights from the community they governed; the question now is, did their immediate successors receive *their* rights and position from the Apostles, or from the community? This is a question that can only be answered from Scripture, from a careful examination of what the Apostles did and said. And when we have satisfied ourselves as to the system pursued by them, then we have a model for our guidance, ratified in Heaven according to the promise of Christ. We repeat, the community did not organize itself. Its first officers were ap-

* Essay 2, § 5.

pointed directly by the Almighty, and subsequently were *inspired* in order to legislate for its members. It, therefore, possessed no such inherent rights. Every society, it is true, has an inherent right to officers and laws, but the Christian Society from the very first had no right to create its officers, or make its own laws; the former were appointed by Christ, the latter were enacted by the Holy Ghost, Who inspired the legislators. If a community, which neither elected its own officers nor framed its own by-laws, which did not even appoint the terms of membership, nor the form of admitting members, if such a community can be said to have any inherent rights, on points vital to the community itself, we are at a loss to discover them. Indeed, there seems to be something very unintelligible in speaking of a society's inherent rights. No doubt officers and by-laws, and methods of admitting and expelling members, are all included in *the idea of a society*; and in some sense a society may be said to have inherent rights to those requisites, without which it could not exist; but the question is not, what items go to make up our idea of a society, but what is the mutual relation of those items to each other and to the society? Is the power to make a man a minister of Christ derived from Christ, or does it come from the people? No one denies that officers, and ships, and articles of war are involved in our idea of a Navy; but, it will altogether depend on circumstances whether the officers' authority proceeds from the commission given them by an absolute monarch, or whether their title be based on the recognition bestowed on them by their crews. In short, few will deny that the SAVIOUR sanctioned the formation of a community, and in so doing sanctioned a mode of government, its officers and laws; but there still remains the question whether *He intended* that His ministers should receive their commission mediately through the community, or immediately from Himself. A king may authorize the embodying of a regiment, and all men may be satisfied that such a command emanated from the king, but still there may be great room for difference of opinion as to the mode of officering it, intended by the king.

This illustration may be expanded, and help us to come to a more complete realization of Christ's Church than we could otherwise arrive at, at least so far as its organization is concerned. Let us suppose, then, that a certain king chose twelve of his subjects, and commissioned them to raise an army of volunteers, the commission empowering the twelve to appoint and commission the officers of the several regiments, and authorizing them to fill up any vacancies that might occur in their own body, and to make any addition to their own num-

bers that circumstances might render necessary, the king's commission extending equally to those whom the twelve appointed as to the twelve themselves. These men repaired to twelve separate districts, for the purpose of recruiting, and the result was that a number of regiments were embodied and officered, forming an army, organized by the original twelve, under the guidance of the king. In process of time, some of the soldiers of several regiments, dissatisfied with the drill and discipline of their officers, deserted, and appointed some of their comrades out of the ranks to be their officers, while they at the same time, loudly disclaimed any intention of rebelling against the king or deserting the common cause; they, however, remonstrated and urged the following plea in justification of their military schism. "Our king authorized the formation of a community called an army, and when he issued his commission he must have known that the idea of officers is inherent in a community, and, *therefore*, since we have rejected our first officers we have elected others in their room." To this it was replied, by the regiments that continued loyal, that the mutineers were evading the whole accusation against them; the question not being whether they were entitled to officers, but who had the power to appoint and commission them.

The mutineers of another regiment pleaded in extenuation of their conduct, "that not only did their original officers render the service insupportable from excessive drill and parade, but that they were endeavoring to infuse into the ranks disloyalty to their sovereign, and were striving to persuade the soldiery to transfer their allegiance to a *certain ambitious Colonel*, who aspired to the office of Commander-in-Chief." To these it was replied by the royalists, "Send up petitions to your king who, if his promises are to be trusted, will relieve you from the grievous treatment you are undergoing, and send you better officers." To this they at once acceded, but the king from wise policy, or to test their loyalty, did not immediately answer their petitions, while the tyranny of the officers became daily more insupportable. The Anglican regiment, therefore, under the guidance of some of their officers who sympathized with their sufferings, set their tyrants aside, reformed their discipline, and under the guidance of the few faithful leaders left, preserved their loyalty untainted. The Irish regiment was warned by this example; the officers, with one or two exceptions, reformed their discipline and returned to their allegiance, and renounced any attachment to the ambitious and designing Colonel. Other regiments, such as the Scottish, totally discarded all the king's officers, nominated others in their stead, and at last engaged in

a civil war with their prince on the subject. One of the loyal regiments also met with a grievous mishap; on a voyage to a foreign country they were wrecked and lost all their officers, while the surviving soldiers were thrown on a desert island. In self-preservation some non-commissioned officers were unanimously elected to command the remnant of the regiment; thus they continued for some time, until their king having heard of their distressed situation, sent them some commissioned officers, and bestowed commissions on some of the gallant men, who from the force of circumstances assumed a temporary command, and thus were they led into a place of safety.

It is hardly necessary to say as a key to this metaphor, that Christ is the King; the Officers the Ministerial successors of the Twelve; the Army, the Church; and as the several regiments, in whatever portion of the globe quartered, have one King, one System of Government, and one uniform, and the possession of these constitute them (say) the British army, so the different Christian communities which are linked together either in one hemisphere or the other, by the possession of ONE LORD, ONE FAITH, ONE BAPTISM, constitute THE CHURCH MILITANT, OR THE KINGDOM OF CHRIST.

From the foregoing remarks, it will be seen, that we argue against the hypothesis that the Church of Christ possesses any inherent rights, in the same sense that human communities may be said to possess them. Almost all the rights conferred on the Christian Society were derived from a source extraneous to itself. They did not originate in it, but were bestowed on it by Christ through the medium of His Apostles. What those rights were, and what was the method of exercising them, we must ascertain from the Scriptures; because we are assured that the mode of organization adopted by the Apostles, and *that only*, was or is Divinely ratified, according to the promise, "whatsoever ye shall bind on earth shall be bound in Heaven." Indeed, Church officers *could* not have derived their rights from the fact of the Church considered as a community recognizing them as functionaries; for certainly the Apostles did not derive their status from the society of Disciples. They received it direct from their Lord. Again, those Elders whom they ordained in every city, and those Superintendents whom they appointed over every Church, clearly derived their powers from the Apostles. Whatever may have been the manner of electing or nominating persons to be created Bishops in the Primitive Church—and that question we do not here discuss—yet the conferring of the Ministerial Gifts was done only by those whom Christ Himself appointed, and to whom He gave power

to be exercised and transmitted for this very end. So that the Christian Ministry is Christ's special gift to the Church, and is not the gift of, or an emanation from the people; which in its idea is an absurdity, and in fact, is contradicted by the plainest testimony of Holy Scripture. Now if Timothy and Titus received their Commission from St. Paul, and in no way based their ministerial authority on their recognition by the Churches at Ephesus or Crete, what reason have we to suppose that the Ministry ordained by them did not succeed to the same rights? At what stage in the history of the Church was the claim to Ministerial authority *first* based on the rights of a community, and not on the clear sanction given to the Apostles to ordain their successors? We shall find it very difficult to fix on any time when such a transfer could have taken place; the idea could never have been broached, until a supposed necessity arising from the strange circumstances in which a Christian body found itself placed, rendered some such theory necessary to justify the appointment of Officers in the Church of Christ by the Laity. Should it be urged that the promise of Divine ratification of their legislative acts was made to the Apostles, not as the *Ministry* but as the *members* of the Church; it may fairly be replied, that inasmuch as the promise "whatsoever ye shall bind on earth," &c., was made to St. Peter individually, and to the Twelve collectively, *and since the words on each occasion must mean the same*, we are driven to the alternative of believing, either that the enactments of every individual Church member were to be divinely sanctioned, (an absurdity,) or that the promise was given to the Apostles as the Officers of the Church.

Dr. Whately dwells at length on the scantiness of detail in Scripture concerning formularies and rules, and he infers from that scantiness, that in such matters the Church was to use its own discretion; and since the accounts of the ordination of the higher officers of the Church are very scanty and incidental, therefore they are to be considered as of little moment in regulating our practice. He says,* "For we may plainly infer from this very circumstance, the design of the Holy Ghost, that those details concerning which no precise directions accompanied with strict injunctions, are to be found in Scripture, were meant to be left to the regulation of each Church, in every age and country." Now it does seem to be a very false inference, to estimate the importance of the several topics introduced, in proportion to the diffuseness of the writer. True

* Essay 2d, Sec. 8.

it is, that men generally dwell more earnestly on those subjects which interest them, and which they deem most essential, and no doubt this rule applies to the writers of the Scriptures; but there is great danger in drawing the inference that the subjects which appear to have interested the Apostles and Evangelists, and upon which they consequently dwelt most diffusely, must for that reason be *more inspired* than those subjects which they notice briefly but decidedly.

To admit that doctrines and rules of discipline are deserving of our attention according to their prominence in Scripture, is equivalent to saying that there are degrees of inspiration, and that the writers were more or less influenced by the Holy Spirit, a position that involves us in perplexity and doubt. That the Holy Spirit, speaking by the Apostles, has selected some points for more special injunction and illustration, cannot be denied, but the cause is apparent; some doctrines required more explanation than others; some were more directly opposed to human nature than others; some were specially required by one Church, some by another; one Apostle has chosen one of these for his theme, another has made choice of a different one; but all this diversity does not arise from different degrees of importance being attached to each according to a graduated scale of inspiration. St. James, probably, would not have written as he has done about good works, had not another Apostle written in equally strong language on the subject of Faith; and therefore, it is more reasonable to attribute the difference in the earnestness and prolixity with which Scriptural topics are inculcated, to the fact that it was the misinterpretation and perversion of one Apostle's writings, which led to the correction of them by another, or by the same Apostle; and he would naturally dwell more fully on the subject presented, than on any other which he might bring forward at the same time. Who would infer from reading the "Directory of Public Worship," that the Westminster Divines intended to allow a greater latitude in the observance of the Sabbath, than in the form of prayer? And yet the detailed directions concerning the Sanctification of the Sabbath are brief, compared with those which relate to the prayers; and would it not be more reasonable to conclude that the reason of the difference in detail was, that some matters are *in themselves* more capable of receiving explanation and minute treatment, and others from a variety of causes more in need of explicit interpretation?

Archbishop Whately strengthens his inference from scantiness of detail, by observing,* "That the matters concerning

* Essay 2d, Sec. 11.

which the Apostle Paul's Epistles do contain the most detailed directions, are most of them precisely those which every one perceives to have relation only to the times in which he wrote; such as the eating or abstaining from 'meats offered to idols,' and the use or abuse of supernatural gifts; he was left, it should seem *unrestrained* in recording, and hence he does record, particular directions in *those cases where there was no danger* of those his directions being applied to *all ages and countries*, as binding on *ev-ry Church for ever*."

Now, if this be a fair statement, to what straits will the readers of Scripture be reduced! First, we are told that no details concerning Christian Communities, which are not accompanied with strict injunctions, are to be considered binding, but are left to the discretion of each Church; and, secondly, that most of the details which do occur, and which *are* accompanied with injunctions, are not now binding, but related to Apostolic times only. Whether, therefore, we meet with details or not, is of little consequence, because when they occur unaccompanied with strict injunctions they are not binding, and when they occur accompanied with strict injunctions they refer to other times than our own. Must not we then conclude, that only the general principles of the New Testament are inspired, and that a considerable portion of the balance, which is devoted to particularities both in history and precept, is but calculated to set us astray, the minute details which are specified being valueless, because they are either unaccompanied with injunctions for their perpetual observance, or because they are obsolete? Can we for a moment suppose that the Holy Spirit ever intended to throw such a stumbling block in the path of Christians, as to inspire the Apostles, and to teach us that He did so inspire them, and yet allow them so to intermingle truths of eternal obligation with details of no moment, that it would require more than ordinary ingenuity to attempt even to distinguish them? Is it to be supposed that He, knowing the tendency of human nature to attach undue importance to trifles, would insert worthless particularities among solemn generalities, and allow them to be received in the Canon of Scripture?

Again; would the Holy Spirit further tempt us to attach due weight to details, by suffering St. Paul to tell us explicitly, when he was speaking *not* "by commandment," and so compel us to infer that everything was important, save what was expressly excepted? Should not the fact that St. Paul declared that there were some things about which he would not write, but would "set them in order when he came," induce us to consider those directions he has given as binding on all Christ-

ians, for this very reason that *they were committed to writing at all?* We are then forced to believe that so far from scantiness of detail implying that the matters referred to, were in their nature indifferent, the topics into the details of which the Apostles thought it necessary to enter, were such, that uninspired men could not readily arrange the execution of them, or carry out their minutiae judiciously.

But it is time to ask, is it true "that the matters concerning which the Apostle Paul's Epistles do contain the most detailed directions, are most of them precisely those which every one perceives to have relation to the times only in which he wrote?" We believe the fact is precisely the reverse. Most of the matters into the details of which the Apostle enters relate to our own times, as well as to the Apostle's days. The two specified by Dr. Whately are not exceptions to this rule, since the Apostle does not descend into details respecting the "eating of things offered to idols," and the abuse of supernatural gifts. He merely answers a question that had been put to him by the Corinthians, regarding the former topic, and decides it on the general principle, "lest I make my brother to offend." Compared with other questions, the details of this point are very brief indeed, nor even though they were much more diffuse could they be said to have relation to Apostolic times only, the Apostle's observations being still valuable and pertinent in all those heathen countries, where Christian Missionaries are laboring.

The other question, viz, the use of supernatural gifts, is more diffusely treated of, but it is an erroneous idea to suppose that the Apostle's detailed observations regarding it were applicable to his days only; true, some of those spiritual gifts, such as prophecy, miracles, and the speaking with tongues, were confined to that age, but then the Apostle treats of the *use* of them *no further* than was necessary to establish for the information of the Church for ever, these two positions; first, the compatibility of a diversity of gifts in the several members of the Church with the absence of schism; and, secondly, the super-excellence of Charity beyond all spiritual gifts; two decisions which we must admit to have universal application in all ages and countries. The *abuse* of these gifts he censures at length, going into detail and giving directions which are as important at this day, as when they were penned; viz, regarding the celebration of public worship in an unknown tongue, and forbidding women to speak in the Church.

We must demur to another assertion of Dr. Whately. "The apostle," he says, "was left *unrestrained* in recording, and hence he does record particular directions in those *cases where there*

was no danger of their being applied to all ages and countries." Without again dwelling on the fact that there must of necessity be always some danger of any details that occurred in the *Word of God* being superstitiously applied, we would proceed to observe, that it would have been more reasonable to speak of the Corinthians being restrained from asking, than the Apostle being restrained from answering in matters of detail; for it should be remembered that St. Paul, in his first Epistle to the Corinthians, in which he dwells most minutely on Ecclesiastical affairs, had not the selection of his own subjects. We have every reason to believe that the Apostle's decisions were regulated by the difficulties submitted to his judgment, and that if he omitted to reply to all those points, he yet selected the most important and urgent items and deferred the settlement of the remainder "till he came." St. Paul was then limited to those subjects on which he was consulted, his determination of which are binding on, and applicable to every age of the Church, as will be seen by glancing at the various points on which he gives sentence. His decisions respecting marriage and celibacy are justly deemed applicable in the present day; his particular injunctions regarding the absurd custom of Christians nicknaming themselves after divers Ministers of the Church, are by no means obsolete; his directions to decide disputes by arbitration, to celebrate the Communion with reverence, unanimity and temperance, his opinion regarding women worshiping with the head covered, and the excommunication of incestuous persons, the right of those who preach the Gospel, to live of the Gospel; these &c., are all as necessary for a Christian Community in the present as in the Apostolic age. Experience shows the permanent applicability of these directions, and we might have concluded so, a priori, because the questions which the Apostle authoritatively determines originated in abuses which were not confined to any one Nation or Church, but which are incident to *human nature*.

We have dwelt at some length on this subject, because it is highly necessary to show the universal applicability of those "*vexatæ quæstiones*" decided by St. Paul. Were it once admitted that the nature of the several cases limited them to the Apostles' times, we should have to acknowledge that a considerable portion of the New Testament had a divine authority to the contemporaries only of the Apostles; we should also be involved in infinite perplexity in determining what were principles and what details—a most difficult task, since it is by generalizing details that we for the most part arrive at principles; thus it is only by examination of the particular qualifications for the office of Priests and Deacons, (which are clearly but details,) that we

arrive at the general principle of the Gospel which forbids polygamy.

But the fact that the Apostle did not *intend* to allow each Church a discretionary power in applying general principles, seems almost certain from other considerations. It is impossible to peruse his writings without observing the anxiety he evinces for *uniformity* in doctrine and discipline in the several Churches. Now there is a positive incompatibility between uniformity in practice, and a permission to each Church to use its own discretion in carrying out the general principles laid down by the Apostles. That St. Paul was in the *habit* of inculcating uniformity is evident from the fact that he sent* Timothy to the Corinthian Church, "To bring you into remembrance of my ways which be in Christ, as *I teach everywhere in every Church.*" To the same Church he recommends a^a mode of making collections on the "first day of the week," and he incidentally mentions that he had given the Galatians a similar command. When he gives judgment concerning the covering of the head in public worship, he silences all caviling by declaring† that "neither have we (that is, the Church at Ephesus, whence he wrote) such custom, neither the Churches of God." When deciding on the course to be pursued by a believer who was married to an infidel, he adds, "and so ordain I in all Churches."‡ Again, that his Epistles were not exclusively applicable to the particular Church to which he happened to be writing, is evident from his recommending the Laodiceans and Colossians to interchange Epistles, and from these considerations we infer that *he habitually taught the necessity of uniformity.*

This probability is further strengthened, when we consider the importance which St. Paul attached to the observance of those ordinances which he once prescribed; for it is but reasonable to suppose that any practice which he valued highly, he would universally recommend. Hear him addressing the Corinthians:§ "Now I praise you, brethren, that ye remember me in all things, and keep the ordinances, as I delivered them to you." To the Thessalonians he says,|| "therefore stand fast, and hold the traditions ye have been taught, whether by word or our Epistle." Now all these texts go to prove that St. Paul attached great weight to the uniform performance of certain practices and formularies; the importance attached to them makes it extremely probable, (and when combined with some positive assertions that we have, absolutely certain,) that uniformity would be aimed at, and established. But there is no conceivable reason why St. Paul should not have wished to perpetuate this uniformity; there was nothing in his own times which ren-

* 1 Cor. iv, 17. † 1 Cor. xi, 16. ‡ 1 Cor. vii, 17. § 1 Cor. xi, 2. || 2 Thes. ii, 15.

dered it more desirable than at other times; we are therefore irresistibly led to the conclusion that his precise directions were designed for the Church at all times, since uniformity in Church discipline would have been absolutely impossible, were it his intention to leave each community a discretionary power in applying the general principles he laid down.

Unless we accept this view of the Apostle's intention, it will be very difficult to account for any *details having been committed to writing at all*. On the supposition that the Apostle wrote under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, what object was to be gained by his committing to writing a large mass of details which were to be exclusively applicable to his own age only? His letters could not carry greater weight than his sermons delivered orally. Some false teachers, indeed, had sneeringly contrasted his writings and his words; but St. Paul declared, "that such as we are in word when we are absent, such will we be also in deed when we are present," and it is not easy to conceive how an Apostle, capable of performing signs and wonders, could gain any end more effectually by writing than by personally regulating Ecclesiastical affairs. Why then did the Holy Spirit prompt these written directions about details? Why select some for writing and others for arrangement by the Apostle in person? The Holy Spirit must have designed to perpetuate everything which he suggested to the Apostle as fit material for written decision or allusion; regulations for the management of a Church which is destined to last till the end of time, must have been intended to suit all times.

We might naturally expect that the Bible would be a practical revelation, but the very reverse would be the case, did it consist of principles only, or did the detailed cases or rules to be found in it refer exclusively to the age in which they were written. Then, indeed, there would be some reason in the asserted necessity for an infallible expositor. This would be the very ground for a Romanist to occupy, for if the Bible were like a Statute-book, containing the general principles of law only, there is at once needed a professional body to interpret and apply them to specific cases, and a court of final appeal to decide on the interpretation. Could we suppose the Scriptures curtailed so as to include nothing but narrative and general principles, the volume so reduced would be infinitely more difficult of comprehension than at present—since the details which appear in it render the general principles more easily understood—like the examples which follow the rules of arithmetic. The parable of the good Samaritan is an exemplification of a general rule, and we readily see how it explains that rule practically; as no doubt had the

general principle of "loving thy neighbor as thyself," been given *without* a detailed example, there would be multitudes to ask in every age, "and who is my neighbor?" Thus it appears that an additional objection to the theory of Dr. Whately is supplied by the consideration, that both the imperfection of language in expressing principles and the incapacity of the human mind to develop them, make it very probable that the Holy Spirit would adapt his revelation to the infirmity of our nature, by divesting it of all needless difficulty.

But, however the Sacred Epistles may be regarded, so far as details are concerned, the Historic portion of the Bible can on no theory of inspiration be reconciled with the assumption, that "those details concerning which no precise directions, accompanied with strict injunctions, occur in Scripture, were meant to be left to the regulation of each Church in each age and country." It may be well to premise that the precise directions and injunctions, required in this assumption as necessary in order to render any Scriptural detail universally obligatory, must be given in general terms to all Christians; because if the meaning be that there must be precise directions from the sacred writers to *their correspondents*, we have all that we contend for admitted. Thus on Dr. Whately's theory it is by no means obligatory to have Presbyters as officers in a Church, because we have no injunctions to that effect given to the Christian body at large. True it is, that Timothy and Titus may have received directions to that end, but there is no such command as this, let every Church be ruled by Elders for ever. Again, the mass of the Christian world believe that the sacred penmen inculcated and wished to perpetuate the worship of the Holy Ghost, the duty of fasting, infant baptism, and the practice of monogamy, yet their writings contain no such explicit injunctions as Dr. Whately's theory requires.

There seems to be more point than is generally imagined in the fact, that the Christian Revelation consists of History as much as epistolary correspondence, that God has spoken to us not only in the writings, but in *the acts* of the Apostles. One obvious result of this arrangement is the strength of evidence derivable from a comparison of the two, and the mutual corroboration afforded—such as the Horæ Paulinæ so powerfully deduces—but we may draw another inference from the method devised by the Holy Spirit, viz, that He intended the Church to be instructed by example as well as precept, and that in all times she should model herself according to the illustration afforded by the Historic account of the primitive Church. If this inference be false, the inspiration of the Historians of the New Testament

becomes unintelligible; for what do we mean when we assert that St. Luke was inspired? Not merely that his narrative was strictly true, because then we should have a greater number of inspired historians than any one will be disposed to recognize. Gamaliel, or some of the many who had taken the history in hand, might possibly have written an account of Christ and his Apostles, strictly true so far as it went, while at the same time they might have been not only uninspired, but unbelieving.

That the facts, again, related were many of them supernatural, gives St. Luke no title to be considered inspired; neither can he claim inspiration on the ground that his materials were revealed to him, since he tells us that they were derived from eye-witnesses of the facts. In what then consisted the inspiration? Clearly in this and nothing else, that the Holy Spirit exercised such a supervision over his writings, as to compel him—whether aware of the compulsion or not—to *select* such anecdotes, conversations and precepts, as should contain a declaration of God's will on those subjects to which they related, and which were of the *highest* importance. The "diversity of times and men's manners" is indeed such, that many are tempted to believe in the axiom, that most of the minutæ recorded were meant to be limited to the times in which they were written, but on careful examination we shall find that all such minute regulations were intended to be of perpetual force, unless expressly limited to the primitive Church by the terms in which they were given. There is not a rule for the guidance of personal conduct or for the management of Ecclesiastical affairs, which a Christian of the present day ought not to be bound by and observe, should he find himself situated in circumstances similar to those which originated the rule. Even the community of goods which existed among the primitive Christians ought undoubtedly to be imitated, should similar circumstances warrant the procedure. Self-preservation, probably, at first caused this self-denying liberality, when all dealings ceased between Jews and Christians, and should an attempt be made to evangelize a heathen city in the present day, it would be incumbent on the converted citizens to adopt a similar measure. And as we know that this inter-community of goods did not obtain universally in the Apostolic age, but was left optional, so in a city or nation wholly Christian, this primitive precedent need not be followed.

Again, the Apostolic decree concerning fornication, pollutions of idols, and blood—which at first sight appear an instance of a rule recorded by the Holy Ghost, and yet, now obsolete—when

examined carefully, ceases to be a difficulty. So much of the decree as relates to fornication and idolatry is clearly obligatory for ever. The only objection arises from the mention of blood. Yet when we remember that the observance of this decree was limited expressly to the Gentile Converts in Antioch, Syria, and Cilicia, *because* the numbers of Jewish residents in those places, who were accustomed to hear "Moses read every Sabbath day," made it expedient that their scruples should be respected; we necessarily conclude that abstinence from blood is still enjoined, *only* when there is such a number of Jewish Converts so zealous for the Law, as to feel offended if their Gentile brethren transgressed in this matter. Such a case may not often occur, though we see nothing to prevent such an emergency arising in the present day in Jerusalem, should the attempt to establish a Christian Bishopric in that city prove successful in making many proselytes from Judaism. But if this be not the true interpretation of the decree, we ask, in what consisted the inspiration of St. Luke, when he penned his account of it?

But let us now regard the details of Church Government that occur in Scripture, in another point of view. On the supposition that the Divine Spirit would interfere *at all* in the organization of the Visible Church, what is the mode of interference which analogy would lead us to expect? Is it not supposable and probable that the positive institutions of Christianity would be prescribed in the same way as the fundamental precepts of religion? What then was that method devised by the Holy Ghost? We reply in the words of Dr. Whately: "The fundamental doctrines and the great moral principles of the Gospel are there taught—for wise reasons no doubt, and which I think we may in part perceive—not in Creeds or other regular formularies, but incidentally, irregularly, and often by oblique allusions; less striking, indeed, at first sight than distinct enunciations and enactments, but often even the more decisive and satisfactory from that very circumstance, because the Apostles frequently allude to some truth as not only essential, but indisputably admitted, and familiarly *known to be* essential by those they were addressing."* This is a fair statement of the method employed by the Sacred writers in delivering to us essential doctrines; and there seems to be no pretext why we should not apply the same reasoning to those rules for Church regulation which are delivered to us in the same manner, especially when we can see how the method adopted in each case may subserve the same moral purpose.

* Essay 2, Sec. 16.

Dr. Whately will not, however, admit this inference, since he says, "That those points which are either wholly passed over in silence, (when they are such that we are certain from the nature of the case, the Apostles must have given some directions concerning them,) or are slightly mentioned, imperfectly described, and incidentally alluded to, must belong to the class of things either altogether indifferent, or so far non-essential in their character that "it is not necessary (as our 34th article expresses it) that they should be in all places one and utterly alike." Now why should we argue from the oblique and incidental manner of alluding to doctrines, that their importance was the more decisive and satisfactory, and yet deny the same reasoning to hold good in the case of discipline or ceremony? Few indeed will be disposed to deny, "that those points which are wholly passed over in silence must belong to the class of things altogether indifferent," but "that those points which are slightly mentioned, imperfectly described, and incidentally alluded to," belong to the same class of things indifferent, we have good reason to doubt. No one could assert that slight mention or incidental allusion to doctrinal points proves them altogether indifferent; on the contrary, as Dr. Whately judiciously observes, this mode of referring to doctrines is the more decisive and satisfactory. What then is the probability against items of Church government being revealed in the same satisfactory manner? Is it not highly probable that we shall find a close analogy between the manner in which doctrines and moral principles are announced, and the manner in which rules for the organization of the Church—which was to perpetuate those doctrines—are intimated to mankind? The most mysterious doctrines and peculiarities of the Christian religion are not given in the Scriptures in such a way as to appear convincingly plain to its readers, or so as to bring overwhelming conviction to a common understanding; on the contrary, they are arrived at inferentially, by a series of deductions, and a process of reasoning. To gain therefore a knowledge of the plan of Salvation, as comprised in the teaching of the New Testament, requires diligent investigation, and the process becomes a test of a virtuous or vicious exercise of the intellect. Why, we again repeat, may not rules of discipline, by the scantiness or deficiency in detail, serve the same end by testing honesty of enquiry? What reason can be plausibly assigned why articles of Faith confessedly fundamental should have been given to the world, not in regular formularies, but in oblique allusions, and yet rules or suggestions for government be treated as things indifferent, though given precisely in the same manner?

In order to make this point as clear as possible, we will give in Dr. W's own language, the apparent reasons for the method adopted for the transmission of the great doctrines of the Gospel, premising, that while we fully concur in his view on the subject, we can see no ground for not applying the same reasoning exactly to the Ecclesiastical allusions in Scripture. In fact, if the words "Church government" be substituted for the words "Gospel truths," in the following passage, the force of the argument is in no wise diminished.

"Suppose such a summary of Gospel truths had been drawn up, and could have been contrived with such exquisite skill as to be sufficient and well adapted for all, of every age and country, what would have been the probable result? It would have commanded the unhesitating assent of all Christians, who would with deep veneration have stored up the very words of it in their memory, without any need of laboriously searching the rest of the Scriptures, to ascertain its agreement with them; which is what we do, (at least are evidently called on to do,) with a human exposition of the Faith; and the absence of the labor, together with the tranquil security as to the correctness of their belief which would have been thus generated, would have ended in a careless and contented apathy. There would have been no room for doubt, no call for vigilant attention in the investigation of truth, none of that effort of mind which is now requisite in comparing one passage with another, and collecting instruction from the scattered, oblique and incidental references to various doctrines in the existing Scriptures; and in consequence, none of that excitement of the best feelings and that improvement of the heart, which are the natural and doubtless the designed result of an humble, diligent and sincere study of the Christian Scriptures."*

The above quotation expressively supplies a reason for the omission of such a compendium of Christian Faith as would have superseded investigation, and we think that the argument is capable of fair extension to the rules of Church discipline; at least we can see no cause for assuming that the *designed* difficulty of ascertaining the certainty of Evangelical truth, affords a more available field for the more discipline of the understanding, than the similar difficulty of arriving at a certainty regarding Apostolic order. Both proceeded from the same source, both are revealed in the same style of writing, have been perpetuated by the same instrument, and may in an important respect have served the same moral purpose; we should therefore hesitate long before we ventured to affirm, that one of them belonged to a class of things "altogether indifferent."

Archbishop Whately instances the account given by St. Luke of the institution of the Diaconate, as furnishing an instance of incidental narrative; and he argues that consequently it is not to be regarded as written for the purpose of

* Essay, p. 34.

supplying any hints for Church government, but merely as an introduction to two great events which were caused by the martyrdom of one of the Deacons, and the preaching of another, viz, the great persecution and the conversion of Samaria. Now, without recurring to the question, in what consisted the inspiration of St. Luke, when he penned an account of the Diaconate—if it be *mere* history—let us examine whether the narrative does really deserve to be called incidental, or more properly accidental; premising, that even though it should prove to be such, still it ought to be regarded as an expression of the will of God, that the Church should ever imitate the Apostolic example, for two reasons. First, because practical truths (as Dr. W. says of Christian doctrine) are taught in the sacred writings, not in formularies, but incidentally and irregularly, and often the more decisively for that very circumstance. And secondly, because no argument can be based on the fact of the Institution *appearing to us* incidental, inasmuch as St. Luke was not so artistic a writer as to take the unnecessary trouble to introduce his events in regular and natural order;—his style being extremely abrupt, and introductions being for the most part dispensed with. This will appear to any one who reflects on the way in which he plunges “in medias res,” his most frequent method being that very indefinite phrase, “it came to pass,” or, “now at that time.” The strength of the argument by which the incidental character of the Diaconate is established, depends a good deal on the fact whether the account given (Acts vi) relates to the appointment of the first Deacons, or to a supplementary body of Grecian Deacons. We say depends a good deal, because the fact that the historian did not think it necessary to relate the ordination of the original Deacons, might make it *appear* probable that his account of the supplementary Diaconate was incidental only.

Yet we cannot admit that this is a probable supposition, since the argument for the permanent force of inspired details forbids our entertaining the idea, the essential point being—*the possession by us of an inspired account of the appointment of certain Church officers by the Apostles*. That the relation given in Acts vi, refers to a second body of Deacons, is not therefore sufficient to prove the narrative incidental, though it might corroborate this view when rendered probable from other considerations, such as the following: “Again (says Dr. W.) every attentive reader must have been struck with the circumstance, that there is no such description on record of the first appointment of the higher orders of Christian Ministers, as there is of the ordination of the inferior class, the Deacons, and this con-

sideration alone would lead a reflecting mind to conclude, or at least strongly suspect, that the particular notice of the appointment of Deacons is incidental only." Dr. W. must mean by "no such description," no such by St. Luke in the Acts of the Apostles, for assuredly the mention made by the Evangelists of the ordination and commission of the Seventy, and the Twelve, both before and after the Resurrection, is quite as diffuse and ample as that of the Deacons; and even as regards the Presbyters, the mention of their duties, and the manner of their ordination, are fully as explicit as that of the Deacons. The account of the Deacon's office and ordination being stated in a single chapter connectedly, while that of the Presbyters is spread over a volume, and can only be arrived at by gathering up fragments of the history and putting them together, may make the account of the former appear more definite; yet we can ascertain the duties of the Presbyters as certainly as those of the Deacons. While there is nothing said of the ordination of the one, which is not said of the ordination of the other, the form in both cases being, prayer and imposition of hands by the Apostles; let it also be remembered, that according to Dr. W's own admission, a fact mentioned incidentally may appear at first sight less striking than a distinct enunciation, though it may be the more decisive for that reason, because the writer may allude to some truth as familiarly *known* to those he was addressing. Now in illustration of this we may mention, that before St. Luke had written anything about the ordination of elders (as in Acts xiv, 23) he incidentally mentions the existence of elders; "which also they did and sent it to *the elders* by the hands of Barnabas and Saul." Acts xi, 30.

The incidental character of the history of the Diaconate consists, according to our author, in its being "a natural and almost necessary introduction to that of two most important events, the great outbreak of persecution consequent on Stephen's martyrdom, and the conversion of Samaria." But admitting that the introduction is a natural one, when we consider that it occurs in the work of a writer remarkable for the suddenness of his transitions, generally dispensing with the natural and connecting links, and commencing and terminating his narratives abruptly, we are led to a directly opposite conclusion, namely, that when he *does* make use of an introduction, the subject matter of it is no less instructive (and no less intentionally so) than the topic to which it leads; since there was nothing to prevent St. Luke introducing us to Stephen and Philip, as abruptly as he does to Saul, Cornelius,

or Apollos. Indeed, abruptness was almost unavoidable in such a work as "the Acts," which is an epitome of what St. Luke considered the most important events comprised in so long a period as thirty years, and when we find such a writer employing an introduction, we may conclude that he had some distinct aim in using what is so foreign to his usual style.

"The conclusion (says Dr. W.) that the particular notice of the appointment of Deacons is incidental only, is greatly strengthened, when on close examination we find reason to be convinced that these so called seven Deacons, who are usually assumed (for I never met with even an attempt at proof) to have been the first that ever held such an office, were in reality only the first Grecian Deacons, and that there were Hebrew Deacons before." The method of proof is briefly as follows. At the time of the murmuring, some dispensers there must have been. That the Apostles did not officiate is plain from the tenor of the narrative which indicates that the appeal was made to them, and that they excused themselves from presiding. The assertion "It is not meet that we should leave the word of God and serve tables," is proof certain that they did not officiate. Again, on reading over the names of the seven Deacons, we find them all of the Hellenistic party; now this surely would have produced in turn, a murmuring of the Hebrews against the Grecians, unless they had *already* some in office to look after their rights. (Essay 2, Sec. 11.)

The above considerations by which the account in Acts vi, is proved to refer to a supplementary body of Grecian Deacons, are very plausible and are fortified by the high authority of Mosheim and Bishops Onderdonk and Whately. Still we cannot assent to their correctness; nor can we help thinking that the real cause why Dr. W. never met with an attempt to prove the appointment of these Deacons the first of the kind, was simply this, that the generality of readers would scarcely think any proof necessary. However, let us now examine the validity of the reasons adduced for considering St. Luke's account to bear reference to the ordination of Hellenistic Deacons, as distinguished from an original Hebrew Diaconate. Now some dispensers of the common fund there must have been, and the question is, did the Apostles hitherto officiate as such dispensers? We think it almost certain that they did dispense the alms of the Church up to the period of the murmuring. For in the first place there is nothing which implies that the multitude appealed to them to undertake this duty; the narrative merely says that in consequence of the discontent, the Twelve called the multitude of the disciples toge-

ther and said "οὐκ ἀρεστον ἐστὶν ἡμᾶς καταλείψαντας τὸν λόγον τοῦ θεοῦ διακονεῖν τραπέζαις,"—the literal translation of which is, "It is not pleasing that we having left the word of God, should be serving tables;"—or in other words, the arrangement by which we dispense the funds of the Church does not give satisfaction, owing to our inability to attend to the duty—our time being occupied with the more pressing duty of preaching the word. This is plainly the meaning of the term, οὐκ ἀρεστον ἐστὶν, which is in opposition to the καὶ ἠρεσεν ὁ λόγος of verse 5, and is in ch. xii, 3, translated in this way, "and when he saw that it pleased the Jews," οὐκ ἀρεστον ἐστὶ τοῖς Ἰουδαίοις. The words which follow, "but we will give ourselves continually to prayer and the ministry of the word," have absolutely no point whatever, unless we suppose that the Twelve had devoted themselves in part to some other duty besides that of the Ministry of the Word. It certainly would have been superfluous to have told the disciples that they would persevere in the Ministry of the Word and prayer, unless something had occurred which seemed to render the matter doubtful.

If confirmation of this view were needed, we have it in the fact, that in the 4th chapter we read that the price of the lands which were sold was "laid at the Apostle's feet and distribution was made to every man according as he had need." St. Peter, again, was evidently the person who received the money from Ananias, and detected his fraud; while there is some significance in the fact that in the space of five verses we read no less than three times, that the money was laid "at the Apostle's feet." We are not, however, to understand that the Apostles from the very first received the funds given by the Christians, as it would appear from ch. ii, 44, 45, that "all that believed were together and had all things common, and sold their possessions and parted them to all as many as had need," implying that the believers mutually assisted each other without the intervention of any officers for the reception or distribution of their alms. A subsequent arrangement was however evidently made by which the Apostles received the funds, though at first they could not have done so; or Peter could not with truth have said to the lame man, "Silver and gold have I none."

As to the objection, that it is not to be supposed that the Apostles would have been guilty of neglect or partiality, we reply, that there is no ground for supposing that the murmuring of the Grecians was warranted; and we should recollect that there existed a hereditary, unappeasable feud between the Aramaic and Hellenistic Jews for centuries, which it seems their common adoption of Christianity could not obliterate.

It is, therefore, more than probable that a discontent, arising between factions predisposed to quarreling, would have but slight foundation, if indeed it had any; the slightest symptom of unfairness would have been sufficient to arouse the old animosity.

But it may be urged, that if the Apostles hitherto officiated, and found from the great increase of disciples, that they themselves were unable to attend to this duty, they would have appointed a larger number than *seven* Deacons. To this we reply, that the number of Deacons required would depend not so much on the number of the disciples, as on the number of *poor* amongst them. This we have no means of ascertaining, but we may reasonably conjecture that seven men specially set apart for the work could easily accomplish what had hitherto been performed by the twelve Apostles in their spare time.

As to the objection that the seven Deacons belonging to the Hellenistic party, would have caused a murmuring of the Hebrews, unless there were already native Jews in office, we answer, that we cannot positively affirm, from the names being Grecian, that there were no native Jews among them. Almost every remarkable person mentioned in the New Testament was known by some surname. Indeed the custom of surnaming seems to have been universal. Perhaps it arose from the increased intercourse between Jerusalem and Grecian cities, which would cause a native Jew's name to be Grecianized, or a Grecian Jew's name to be Hebraized according to his place of residence. But from whatever cause arising, the fact seems to be that native Jews very generally possessed a Grecian surname. Thus St. Paul's name amongst the native Jews would be Σαουλ, and it is remarkable that St. Luke, when speaking of him calls him by his Grecian name Σαυλος, but when he records his being addressed from Heaven, he uses the Hebrew form of the name,—*vide* Acts 9, 4 and 22, 7,—since we are told that the voice spake to him in that language. Some of the Apostles also had Grecian names, such as Διδυμος, Πέτρος, Φίλιππος, but we are not to infer that they were Hellenists. St. Mark's Jewish name was John, but his Grecian surname Μάρκος. Similarly we find the Jewish names Tabitha and Simeon surnamed Δορκας and Νύκτα. Now as St. Luke was a Gentile and writing to a Gentile, the probability is that he would, whenever it was possible, give the Grecian name of his characters, and hence we are led to infer that no confidence can be placed in any argument drawn from the names of the seven Deacons.

Again, if the Seven were to be a Grecian body exclusively, we cannot understand why the Apostles should have given the election of them to the whole multitude of the disciples and not to the Grecians alone, particularly as the Aramaic and Hellenistic Christians would worship in different Synagogues, after their conversion to Christianity, as well as before that event. Neither on this supposition is the gratification of the *whole* multitude intelligible. It is hard to conceive why the Hebrew portion which comprised the great mass of Christians, should have been pleased with the proposition; the division of labor thus introduced, together with the prospect of increased efficiency on the part of the Apostles, when relieved from secular employment, would naturally please the Christian community, but the addition of Grecian Deacons, to counteract the inattention or partiality of Hebrews, was in itself not calculated to cause such pleasing unanimity. There seems also to be a difficulty in explaining how it happened, that the Grecians murmured against the Hebrews as a body. Why not murmur against the dispensers of the fund, rather than against the donors of it? It is but reasonable to believe that the greater part of the fund was contributed by native Jews. The Grecian minority, therefore, could not well have found fault with the Hebrews collectively, if there were almoners specially appointed to whose conduct they could with more fairness object. But on the supposition that the Apostles had hitherto, as far as time permitted, performed the duty, we at once see how delicacy and respect would prevent the Grecians from condemning the Apostles who had so powerful an apology as that of the ministry of the word, to excuse any neglect. The natural course which discontented men would under the circumstances have pursued, was to show their dissatisfaction with the Apostles, by murmuring not against them, but their countrymen.

From all these considerations we conclude that the account given (Acts vi) refers to the first appointment of Deacons;—the Apostles having *resigned*, not *declined*, the duty of serving tables,—and therefore the argument for the incidental character of the narrative, so far as it is founded on the supposition that there already existed a Hebrew Diaconate, falls to the ground.

Before leaving this subject of the Diaconate, we would observe, that there are some considerations which would lead us to conjecture that the Seven were ordained not as a resident Board to dispense the alms of the Church at Jerusalem perma-

nently, but as a body of Missionaries to establish the Diaconate in foreign Churches. One or two of the Seven may have been stationed at Jerusalem, but the Holy Spirit may have designed that a greater number than was absolutely necessary should be ordained, for the purpose of extending the Church organization of Jerusalem to other places. This may not indeed have been the intention of the Apostles or the Disciples in appointing the Seven; but the Christians were so soon to be scattered by persecution, that it could not have been with a view to the benefit of the poor Christians at Jerusalem, that the Holy Spirit devised the Diaconate; and when the persecution ceased, and "the Church had rest," we have no account of the Deacons returning to Jerusalem and resuming their duties. The probability is that they did not return, since the alms of the Christians at Antioch, which were dispatched to the poor Christians of Judæa in the dearth that occurred in the reign of Claudius, were sent to the Elders, not to the Deacons of the Church.

If this surmise be correct, we can see a design in the selection of a majority of the Seven from the Hellenistic party, as Jews speaking the Greek language would be much more likely to prove successful Missionaries to the Gentiles. It will appear also on close examination that the *incidental* character of the account of the Diaconate, cannot be established from any close connection that is supposed to exist between St. Stephen's Martyrdom and the great persecution which through "the dispersion of the Christians led to the founding of the first purely Gentile Church at Antioch." Certainly this was a most important event, but it might have been recorded by St. Luke without any reference to St. Stephen, and consequently without any allusion to the Deacons, of whom he was the most distinguished member,—internal evidence inducing us to believe that St. Stephen's death did not lead to a persecution,—but was a result of a persecution already existing. We are not told by the historian, nor have we any reason to conclude, that the persecution mentioned in Acts iv, and which caused the imprisonment of the Apostles, had ceased. No such expression occurs, as we read afterwards when persecution ceased, "then had the Churches rest;" nor is it said, at that time there *arose* a great persecution, but "at that time there *was* a great persecution."

Again, it is clear that *at the time* of St. Stephen's Martyrdom, the Christians were scattered through Judæa and Samaria—otherwise we are forced to believe that the whole body of disciples, amounting to many thousands, fled from Je-

rusalem in the short space of time intervening between St. Stephen's death and burial—the dispersion of the disciples being evidently mentioned to account for the fact of the Martyr's obsequies devolving on “devout men,” that is, converts from Idolatry to Judaism. Unless we accept this interpretation, verse second seems most awkwardly thrust into the account of the persecution, without any connexion with the narrative. But if we translate the verse thus, “*But* devout men carried Stephen to his burial,” the sense becomes apparent, the persecution already existing had scattered the disciples, but devout men supplied their place at the interment. The idea that St. Stephen's martyrdom led to the persecution, seems justified by the words of the historian, Chapter xi, 19—“Now they which were scattered abroad upon the persecution which arose about Stephen”—but the considerations mentioned, would lead us to conjecture that there must be some mistake in the reading or translation of the passage. Accordingly we find Griesbach considering the reading *ἐπὶ Στεφάνῳ* to be preferred, and the text may accordingly be translated, “the persecution that arose in Stephen's time,”—or while Stephen's wonderful career was going on—as we read in the 28th verse, the words *ἐπὶ Κλαυδίου* translated, “in the days of Claudius Caesar.”

To us, it seems little short of certainty that there is a system of Church Government absolute and definite prescribed in the New Testament. It is nothing to the purpose to affirm that Christian communities cannot agree in the reception of any one universal system. Neither can they unite in the affirmation of any one creed of doctrine. Nor is it more surprising that the Scriptural mode of organizing a Church should not be unanimously adopted, than that the doctrines of Election and Free-will, Salvation by Faith and works, should still be undecided questions, and each possess enthusiastic opponents and adherents. It is quite possible that former ages may have approximated nearer to the Scriptural standard of Church organization than the present; some communities may now approach nearly (very nearly) to the Apostolic model, while others may not attain to the slightest resemblance to it. There may not be a Church on earth that *fully* comes up to that exemplar which may be inferred by fair process of reasoning from the Apostles' language. Yet still, it may be no less true, that in that language is to be found directions sufficient to guide an honest, impartial mind to a recognition of that Visible Church, which existed in the Apostles' days with the Apostles' sanction. This discovery may have been made partially at one age, more nearly at another,

but never as yet completely and exactly, because we are led irresistibly by the analogy of nature and the result of experience to acquiesce in the profound remark of Bishop Butler, that "it is not at all incredible that a book which has been so long in the possession of mankind should contain many truths as yet undiscovered."

From the analogy, therefore, which really and naturally exists between the style, the designed style in which Doctrines and rules of Government are revealed, we are forced to object to any theory which would represent the latter as indifferent; and it is mere idleness to object that some of those rules are plainly inapplicable to the present day, because, had those rules been followed from the beginning, they would not now be obsolete or inappropriate. To quote again the words of the incomparable reasoner above alluded to, "we cannot proceed one step in reasoning upon natural religion any more than upon Christianity without laying it down as a first principle, that the dispensations of Providence are not to be judged of by their perversions, but by their genuine tendencies, not by what they do actually seem to effect, but by what they would effect, if mankind did their part."

ART. IV.—DR. JOHN ESTEN COOKE.

WE have long been anxious to discharge a sacred duty which we owe to the Church and to the memory of one of her most devoted sons—the late John Esten Cooke, M. D. Dr. Cooke was one of the most remarkable men of our day. With great powers of observation and application, there was combined in him a logical force unsurpassed and hardly equaled, by any of his contemporaries in Church or State. The greater part of his life was spent in the active practice of his arduous and engrossing profession, and in the composition of some of the ablest works that have ever illustrated and enlarged the science of medicine. Long after he had passed the meridian of life, and while he was in the full practice of his profession, and engaged with all the earnestness and enthusiasm of his character in teaching this noble science to others, he was led, by an apparent accident, but by a real Providence, to examine the history and constitution of the Christian Church. The absorbing interest of the theme at once enlisted all his powers. With unparalleled industry and intense concentration of mind, he gave himself up to the enquiry. In a few months he accumulated and thoroughly digested the lore which ordinary theologians require a lifetime to obtain. The remarkable publications in which he exhibited the results of his great mind, operating upon this mass of erudition, placed him at once in the front rank of the theological writers of his age and country. For many years after this, he continued to be the enthusiastic student and the successful teacher of both these two great departments of human learning—Medicine and Theology. It is due to the Church and to the world, that the memory of such a man should not die.

John Esten Cooke was born in Boston, Mass., on the 2nd of March, 1783, while his parents were on a visit to that city. His father, Dr. Stephen Cooke, and his mother, Catharine Esten, were natives of the island of Bermuda, "connected," says Mr. Caswall, "with some distinguished families in England." They continued to reside in Bermuda until 1791. In that year they removed to Alexandria, in Virginia, and not long afterwards to Loudon County, Va., near Leesburg. They had eight children, six sons and two daughters. One of the sons, John R. Cooke, attained to considerable eminence at the

bar; and another, St. George Cooke, is still serving with distinguished reputation in the army of the United States.

John Esten Cooke, the eldest son, received the degree of Doctor of Medicine, from the University of Pennsylvania, and commenced the practice of his profession in Warrenton, Fauquier County, Va. In 1821, he removed to Winchester, then the chief town of the "Great Valley of Virginia." In this rich and beautiful valley flows the Shenandoah to its junction with the Potomac, having the Blue Ridge on the East, and the Alleghany mountains on the West. Dr. Cooke remained in this place in the active practice, and in the enthusiastic study, of his profession, until 1827. Here he published an *Essay on Fever*, which excited very great attention, and soon afterwards the first volume of his great work on *Pathology and Therapeutics*.

In 1827, Dr. Cooke was elected to the Chair of the Theory and Practice of Medicine in the University of Transylvania; and, accepting that office, removed the same year with his family to Lexington, Ky.

His career as a Professor in that school, was one great and almost unexampled triumph. Although troubled with a slight impediment of speech, the earnestness of his manner, the depth of his convictions, the singleness of his purpose, the simplicity and comprehensiveness of his views, and the evident intensity of his devotion to truth, made him the most interesting of lecturers. His system of Pathology, and the practice founded thereon, very soon obtained an unquestioned ascendancy, and almost universal acceptance, in the West and Southwest.

The simplicity of that system, and the consequent facility with which it could be abused by inexperienced and unskillful physicians, and even by unprofessional persons, are probably the causes in part of the rapid decline of the system in professional favor, about the time that Dr. Cooke ceased to be its public teacher and expounder. Another, and the principal cause for this result, is the fact that the current literature of the Medical profession in this country, comes from London, Edinburgh, and Paris.

That a Medical system, proposing itself as true and substantial, and implying of course that preceding systems had been visionary and shadowy, and therefore entitled to take the place of them all, and to keep it, had originated with a country Doctor in the Valley of Virginia, or with a Professor in a backwoods college at Lexington, Ky., was an idea which the profession at large would not entertain. So the influence of Dr. Cooke's lectures and writings was confined to the West. The magnates of the profession in the great Eastern cities and

colleges, paid little or no attention to this new system, and still continued to look for knowledge and instruction to European centres of intelligence.

Soon after his removal to Lexington, Dr. Cooke published the second volume of his treatise on Pathology and Therapeutics. Of this remarkable effort of genius and labor, we of course express our own opinion in saying, that it is unsurpassed by the profoundest works in Law, Theology, or Medicine, for its large array of facts, and for its close and impenetrable logic.

In 1828, Dr. Cooke, in conjunction with Dr. Charles W. Short, Professor of *Materia Medica* and Medical Botany in the same University, commenced the publication of "*The Transylvania Journal of Medicine and the Associate Sciences.*" All the early volumes of this Journal are enriched by the labors of Dr. Cooke. He contributed to it a succession of valuable papers on many of the most important practical questions connected with his profession. Speaking of these papers, the Editor of the *Western Journal of Medicine and Surgery*, said in 1854, "Honesty of purpose marks everything which has emanated from the pen of Dr. Cooke. It is visible in every page of his voluminous writings. He sought truth, and truth only. He never contended for victory, but for principle. * * * * * His works are models of a clear, direct, simple style." Dr. Yandell very beautifully adds, "It has been remarked, that few men can be trusted to write their own biographies. Dr. Cooke is one of the few who, without any detriment to his fame, might have performed that delicate work. He would have written his life with all the honesty that he lived it—with perfect impartiality, keeping nothing back through a weak vanity, and exaggerating nothing." (*West. Journal of M. and S.*, Oct., 1854.)

The Medical views of Dr. Cooke, so ably and perseveringly maintained, were subjected to a severe but triumphant test by the Cholera which desolated Lexington in 1833. Dr. C. was in Philadelphia at the time of its terrific access. He hurried to the scene of danger as fast as the conveyances of the day would admit, and threw himself into the conflict with his wonted energy and decision. He considered Cholera as belonging to the class of Malarious diseases, and treated it as such, but with a vigor of administration proportioned to the frightful violence of the malady. In a paper published in the *Transylvania Journal of Med.*, he gives a history of each case, and demonstrates, as far as complete success could do it, the soundness of his views, and the propriety of his treatment.

It was during this most active period of his active life that Dr. Cooke was called upon to turn his great powers to another

and very different field of research. For many years previous to 1829, he had been a zealous and devoted member of the Methodist Communion. The causes that induced him to abandon this connection, and to attach himself to the Protestant Episcopal Church, are fully stated by himself in the introduction to his Essay on "The Invalidity of Presbyterian Ordination." The extract we give is long, but it will well repay perusal.

"When a man who has, for eighteen years of his life, taken an active part in the concerns of a religious society, and promoted its interests with all his power, leaves it and attaches himself to another, a decent respect for their opinion, as well as a proper regard for his own character for consistency and uprightness, renders it not improper that he should state the reasons which induced him to make the change. This I propose to do in the following pages.

"Those who know me intimately, know that I have ever embraced the truth when convinced I had discovered it, with little regard for the consequences that might follow. Having had the truths of the Christian religion impressed upon my mind by the unwearied care of a most affectionate mother, I occasionally had serious reflections on the subject, although in general by far too indifferent to it, until about nineteen years ago. In the summer of 1810, I met with a pamphlet called the 'Star in the East,' by Dr. Buchanan, giving an account, among other things, of the discovery of a Christian Church in Hindoostan, secluded from all the world, which derived its origin from the Apostles themselves. This narrative produced a very strong impression on my mind, and, as I had been for some months more thoughtful than common on the subject of religion, I determined to investigate the evidence on which the doctrines of the Christian religion rest. Shortly after, a book-peddler passed through the village, and I purchased a Bible with Canne's marginal references, and Bishop Porteus' Evidences of the Christian Revelation.

"I had always been in the habit of requiring strong evidence upon every subject, and never yielding assent to any thing that was not supported by it. I sat down, therefore, to the reading of Porteus with the determination narrowly to examine and weigh every argument.

"The result was a strong impression made on my mind by the first perusal, during which no quotations from the Scripture were examined, the interest excited by the force of the argument being too great to allow stopping to examine them. The book was read, however, very attentively a second time, with careful examinations of the quotations of Scripture, and the

result was a thorough conviction of the truth of the Christian Revelation; immediately on expressing which to myself, with an audible voice, I felt my mind drawn out in a feeling of gratitude and love to that Saviour who had died that I might live—the first I had experienced, and not to be forgotten while life and recollection shall continue. The first reading of this book was in September or October, 1810. It had such an effect on my mind as to lead me to regular private devotion. The second reading was about Christmas.

“Between the middle and end of January, I heard my friend Mr. Yidings, to whom I was then an entire stranger, preach for the first time, and again on the Sunday following, and was so much pleased that on the Sunday week after I became a member of the Methodist Society, which I then considered the purest Church as to doctrine. In that society I have continued ever since, in general, well satisfied; and among its members, but particularly the preachers of the Baltimore Annual Conference, I have many valued friends. These I would not offend, I would not appear to slight, for any thing less than conscience’ sake. That I have, until within the last eight weeks, taken an active part in promoting the welfare of the society which I have left, is well known to some of them, and was not long ago evinced in the part I took in the establishment of a religious paper to be published by the Methodist Society.

“Soon after that time a volume of sermons by the Rev. Dr. Chapman, for which I had subscribed, was brought home, and for some days no attention was paid to it. At a leisure moment curiosity led me to look into it, when I found the manner and style so striking, and the subject so new to me, that I determined to read the book. I had heard that the Church denied the validity of Presbyterian ordination; but had never thought it worth while to inquire into a claim at first sight apparently so extravagant. I was determined to see what could be said in support of such pretensions. I read carefully the first seven sermons, by which I was most forcibly struck. The language chaste, the style perspicuous, I was carried along without labor, and comprehended without the slightest effort. The manner of handling the subject was strikingly moderate, and as charitable as any man could reasonably desire. Supporting the doctrine of the invalidity of ordination by Presbyters, and the validity by Episcopal ordination alone, the author proceeds in maintaining the argument, without uncharitable reflections; and when he condemns, does it in the mildest language, and often or always with expressions of good opinion of the motives of the opposite party. If there is any thing offensive to any one, in the book, it is a quotation—and quotations

a man is bound to state as they are stated by the author from whom they are taken. To do otherwise, to change language, to curtail, to omit material expressions, without informing the reader, is to act corruptly, and is so esteemed by all men of letters, and justly so.

"The argument itself is exceedingly strong, and in the language of a gentleman of this place in conversation with me, it is the best array of the question, perhaps, anywhere to be found in the same compass.

"The strength of the direct argument for the doctrine, and of that indirect one, growing out of the evil consequences of schism, or division from the Church, contained in some of the following sermons, is such, that I was compelled to say to myself, if these facts are so, this doctrine is the truth. Uneasiness now sprung up in my mind. The question arose, what if it be true? Can you leave your friends, your intimate associates in what has engaged so much of your attention, your efforts, your ardent desires for eighteen years, and go to a people who, prejudice whispered, are no people? The answer of conscience was, if it be the truth, embrace it, and leave the consequences to Him, who revealed His will to man for his guidance.

"The question now was, is this doctrine true? To determine this without delay, I sought information from ministers of the principal denominations involved in the doubt as to the validity of Presbyterian ordination, viz: the Presbyterians, the Methodists, and Baptists. With one consent they all referred me to Miller's Letters on this subject. This book I immediately obtained. Emory and Bangs were also mentioned, and were likewise obtained.

"Meeting Dr. Chapman in the street, I inquired of him also what were the standard works on this controversy. He also mentioned Miller, and stated that Bowden had answered him. He also mentioned Lord King, (by whom John Wesley was influenced,) and Slater's Original Draught, in answer to King, as well as Potter on Church Government, and Hooker's work.

"I immediately commenced reading Miller with great attention, read over and over the arguments respecting the order of the Church in the time of the Apostles and for centuries afterwards, with his quotations from such of the Fathers as could be procured conveniently; and with regard to those which I had not, I was enabled to form a very good idea from comparing him with Bowden. Thus, if he quoted a passage from an author which I had not the means of consulting, Bowden was examined to see what reply was made; if admitted by him, it could not be questioned; if not admitted, Miller's reply to Bowden's answer was examined; and if necessary, Bowden's rejoinder to Miller's reply.

So that from the two works of each, it was not a difficult matter, with care, to make out what was agreed to by both these able disputants, and what was asserted, but, when answered, not maintained in the reply, and therefore given up; in short, it was not difficult to get at the truth.

"The result of the whole investigation, after six weeks' close inquiry, was a thorough conviction of the truth of the doctrine that Presbyterian ordination is unauthorized by scripture, and therefore entirely invalid.

"In order that those of my friends and others into whose hands this pamphlet falls, without having it in their power to consult the books above mentioned, may be able to judge of the validity of the reasons on which rests the conclusion I have come to, I propose to make some remarks on the argument of Dr. Miller, the statements he has advanced, and the manner in which he has answered the arguments of the Episcopal writers; and close with a condensed statement of facts showing the invalidity of Presbyterian ordination."

The statement of some further circumstances attending this conversion will be interesting, as eminently characteristic of the man. Dr. Cooke had only subscribed to the volume containing Chapman's Sermons as a matter of courtesy to a colleague, Dr. Chapman being one of the Professors in Transylvania University. After the book had been sent to his house, Dr. Cooke remarked to his family and to some friends at dinner, how strange it was that so intelligent and good a man as Dr. Chapman should entertain, and attempt to propagate, the narrow-minded notions which he had heard were in his book. On the following Sunday, between breakfast and Church time, he took this book from the parlor table where it had first been placed, and began to read it. By the time the family were ready to go to Church he had become intensely interested in the book. He saw that there was a real question raised in it which he was bound to determine. He permitted his family therefore to go alone, while he continued his examination of the argument which was to control his future religious position. The doubt once planted in his mind as to the ministerial authority of those to whose jurisdiction he had heretofore submitted, he could take no rest until the doubt was resolved.

The Library of the University, rich in many old books, and the private libraries of Lexington, were diligently ransacked. The examination was begun and prosecuted with all the ardor of a strong and enthusiastic nature. Only four hours were allowed for sleep; one hour was given to the accustomed lecture to the Medical Class; the shortest possible time to meals;

and all the rest of the twenty-four, with all the concentration of his great powers, devoted to the absorbing enquiry upon which he had entered.

To relieve the brain from the effects of this intense and unremitted application, and to keep his mind in its highest state of free and vigorous action, he several times bled himself during the six weeks of this remarkable investigation. At the end of that time his conviction was complete, and the materials of that conviction, soon afterwards embodied into the Essay above mentioned, were accumulated, and ready for present and future use. He immediately connected himself with the Episcopal Church, and neither he nor his family ever after attended any other form of worship.

The first duty required of Dr. Cooke, was to satisfy the public mind, greatly excited by his conversion, as to the grounds of it. For this purpose he published one of the most powerful and conclusive arguments ever produced upon the question of Church government—the Essay on the Invalidity of Presbyterian Ordination. This masterly work made a deep impression upon the public, and upon the Church. It was immediately republished in New York, and scattered in various forms over the country. Dr. Miller, or some friend of his, attempted a reply in the Princeton Review. But this was met by a crushing rejoinder from Dr. Cooke, which damaged yet more the cause which the Review had tried to defend.

With all the force and enthusiasm of his character Dr. Cooke now applied himself to raise up the Church in Kentucky, from her fallen and desolate condition. The consecration of a Bishop for the Diocese in 1832, the establishment of a Theological Seminary at Lexington in 1834, the attraction to the same place of a body of learned and distinguished Ministers of the Church—among whom may be mentioned the Rev. Dr. Coit, the two Leacocks, the Rev. Henry Caswall, and the Rev. B. O. Peers—attest the earnestness and enthusiasm with which he gave himself to this genial work.

As Professor of the History and Polity of the Church in the Theological Seminary, and as a member of the Standing Committee of the Diocese, Dr. Cooke employed the whole force of his character and genius in aid of the rising fortunes of the Church. He very soon accumulated one of the best private theological libraries in this country, the greater part of which has since passed into the hands of the Bishop of Louisiana.

As a Delegate to the General Convention, which assembled in Philadelphia, in 1835, Dr. Cooke started from their quiet conservatism the members of that body, by introducing a reso-

lution providing for the immediate election and consecration of a Bishop for each State and Territory in the United States, in which there was no Bishop. This sweeping, thorough, and admirable proposition was afterwards whittled down by the cautious policy of the Convention to the election of two Missionary Bishops for the West. And of these only one was actually consecrated. Thus again the Church was found lagging far behind her duty and her calling.

Another effort which he made, in conjunction with the able theologians then gathered at Lexington, to advance the cause of the Church in Kentucky, was the establishment of a religious paper called the Church Advocate. For sometime Dr. Cooke edited this paper himself, but subsequently committed that work to the Rev. Henry Caswall.

It is well known that this early dawn of the Church's prosperity in Kentucky, was soon and sadly overcast. To inquire into the causes of this sudden eclipse of so bright a promise would be an ungrateful and a painful task. To bring up again the memory of old troubles, of criminations and recriminations, between men who were all anxious to do good, but who partook of the common infirmities of human nature, could be of no possible service to the Church. Better let it all be forgotten.

One practical conclusion may perhaps be profitably drawn. The effort then made for the extension of the Church in Kentucky, involved too much centralization. The large ecclesiastical force concentrated at Lexington, was utterly disproportioned to the condition and strength of the Diocese. It was an enormous head without a body. If Dr. Cooke and his fellow Churchmen could have brought from the East a band of *itinerant preachers*, and sent them, with the Bishop at their head, through the State, gathering up and organizing into congregations the Episcopal families which were thickly scattered over the whole country, the result would have been very different.

At that time the traditional regard and love for the Episcopal Church, which the educated class of emigrants from Virginia brought with them, had not yet ceased. The old dust-covered Prayer-books were still in many a house; and out of those Prayer-books some of the older persons had been taught the catechism in their childhood. This was the feeling which built up the Church at Lexington, and at Louisville. In these places, the principal towns of the State, the old Church influence was found to be strong enough to support a stationed minister as soon as the trial was made. In other parts of the State this

influence was diffused over too large a space to be reached effectually in any other way than by a *mission* embracing a large district, every prominent point in the district being served by the same Minister. This was the system by which the Church was so rapidly resuscitated in Virginia, the old home of the fathers of these Kentuckians. When the venerable Richard Channing Moore, with his lofty and subduing eloquence, sounded the rallying cry throughout the Eastern counties of the Old Dominion, a glad and grateful response came up from every neighborhood, and the Church was at once re-established in the hearts of the people. Unhappily this policy was not pursued in Kentucky, and the consequence is that we still mourn, and will probably long be compelled to mourn, over the deplorable weakness of the Church in this Diocese.

All that can possibly be said in censure of Dr. Cooke, in regard to the unhappy condition of the Diocese, which so soon followed its too sudden prosperity, may also be used in his vindication, viz: that he enacted the part which belonged to the sternness of his character, to his intense devotion to truth, and to his uncompromising spirit. To these severer traits of character in him, and in some of his compeers, may possibly be attributed, in part, the disasters which ensued. More pliability, and a larger allowance for human infirmity than these gentlemen possessed or exercised, would seem, from the result of this case, to be necessary to the successful conduct of affairs. Certain it is, that to look for perfection in men, and to stop the wheels of government until it can be found, will render any government and any society impracticable.

Disappointed and disheartened by the course which things had taken, Dr. Cooke threw up all his ecclesiastical appointments, but remained to the last a devout, earnest, honest, and simple-hearted Christian, passionately devoted to the cause of Christ and the Church.

Dr. Cooke remained for ten years in Lexington, earnestly laboring in the two departments of human knowledge to which he devoted his whole powers, medical science, and Christian truth. A noble champion he was in both fields, and worthy to be held in ever-during remembrance.

About the close of this period, the admirable position, and the rapid growth of Louisville, induced the majority of the Professors in Transylvania to look to that City as the most eligible place in the Western country for the establishment of a great Medical School. Accordingly, in 1837, Dr. Cooke removed from Lexington to Louisville, and united with Drs. Caldwell, Yandell, and Short, in founding the Medical Insti-

tute of that city; now known as the Medical Department of the University of Louisville. He continued to teach in this school until its prosperity was placed beyond the reach of question, or of Western competition.

In 1844, Dr. Cooke resigned his professorship and retired to Woodlawn, a beautiful farm in the neighborhood of Louisville. A few years later, in 1848, he purchased a large unimproved estate on the bank of the Ohio river, about thirty miles above Louisville, where his restless energies were employed in the inappropriate labors, for him, of the farmer and the pioneer. The wild beauties of nature, which he intensely enjoyed, the love of his family, and the consolations of religion, were here his solace and delight.

For many years he had been subject, upon exposure, to violent attacks of inflammation of the lungs. These he had often removed by the prompt application of his own vigorous treatment. These attacks became so frequent under the exposure incident to his new mode of life on the Ohio, that his strong constitution gradually gave way; and on the 19th of October, 1853, in the 71st year of his age, he breathed his last, with a firm trust in the mercy of the Saviour whom he had loved and served for the greater part of a long life. While on his death bed, for many weeks, and until within a few hours of his death, the Greek Testament was his constant companion. All day long, and every day, he pored over its sacred pages with critical attention and with devout affection. His mind retained its power and freshness to the last, and to the last he was, as he had ever been, the single hearted worshiper of truth. Truth and Love he found embodied in the Word of the Almighty, and on that his soul rested, in life and in death, with satisfied delight.

There were two marked features of Dr. Cooke's character which precluded his ever attaining to vulgar popularity; and which must be allowed to have diminished greatly his capacity for usefulness. These were his indifference to public opinion, and his stern intolerance of error and flippancy. He threw his great truths before the world, and used no further care to commend or introduce them. He took it for granted that every man would be as devout a worshiper of Truth as himself, and he was at very little pains to conceal his contempt for those who seemed to care more for everything else than for truth. This disposition created for him many enemies, and was one cause of his premature withdrawal from public employments.

It is no bad illustration of the character of both to mention that Dr. Cooke admired beyond any man of his time a rising

statesman of Kentucky, the Hon. Garrett Davis. Their personal acquaintance was very slight, but congeniality of mind and character excited this admiration. Dr. Cooke loved and honored Davis, because Davis loved and honored truth more than place and power and popularity; and was utterly fearless and regardless of consequences in his advocacy of truth. Not very long before his death the Doctor was introduced to Davis in the Court House yard, at Paris, Ky. Not attending particularly to the name, the introduction passed as such things usually do. A moment after he learned to whom he had been speaking. Instantly he sought for Davis in the crowd, and grasping again his hand, told him that he was the man of all others he wanted to see—the man who was never afraid to speak the truth.

Stern, and sometimes even harsh, in his intercourse with the world, Dr. Cooke was gentle, tender, and childlike in his religious affections, in the domestic circle, and in social intercourse with the friends he loved. With these last he was ever the warm hearted, genial companion. Without reserve he unboomed himself to them, and enjoyed beyond most men the pleasures of conversation—the delightful interchange of thought and feeling.

It was deeply affecting to see that strong old man passionately weeping at bidding adieu to the Christian Minister, who, from time to time, celebrated at his secluded home on the Ohio the solemn offices of religion. The profound religious sensibility of this great man, so learned, so powerful in intellect, and so strong in all the elements of true manhood, is a withering rebuke to the vulgar irreligion of the vain, the trifling, and the ignorant.

Dr. Cooke frequently, in the last year of his life, expressed a wish to prepare a Popular Manual for the benefit of several large classes of sufferers, setting forth the method by which he had been accustomed to relieve them, and the principles of that method. It will be an appropriate tribute to the memory of this good man to present, especially to the Clergy, his *rational* of the invalid state into which they are so liable to fall, and the means of preventing or relieving it. The account is drawn up with especial reference to the Clergy, but it is equally applicable to all who are similarly affected, and especially to the whole army of dyspeptics of every class and profession. The following is a brief statement of its principles and reasonings, and which in this place deserves to be presented to the reader.

All general disease is an approximation, more or less remote, to death. In death the arteries are diminished, the extremities shriveled, and a great portion of the blood engorged in the right side of the heart and in the great venous cavities of the body. The chill which precedes a fever furnishes an instance of a rapid approach to this state. The pallor, the coldness, the shrunken extremities, the diminished arterial action, present a very ominous counterfeit semblance of death; and unless that condition is changed there would soon be no counterfeit, but the reality. Fever is the result of the vital force repelling with urgent violence the insidious mischief, the creeping death. Unless the fever supervene, death must ensue. All the apparent symptoms of a chill indicate that a large portion of the blood is engorged in the right side of the heart, and in the great venous trunks.

But everything that diminishes the force of the circulation tends, in its degree, to produce this same result. For if the blood is not sent with sufficient force through the lungs to be purified and oxygenated, and is not then sent to the extremities of the system to be used, it must *necessarily accumulate* as black, impure blood, in the vena cava and in the other large receptacles of venous blood. This process once begun, perpetuates and reproduces itself in two ways: 1st, The venous receptacles become enlarged and weakened, making it more difficult for the blood to be returned to the heart. 2d, The less the blood is oxygenated the less can it stimulate the heart to action. In old age the circulating force gradually decreases—more and more of the blood is retained in the venous system—giving rise to the stiffness, aches, and pains of age, and as this process gradually goes on, death must inevitably at last ensue. Most general chronic affections are just an anticipation of this state.

Whatever diminishes the force of the circulation below the standard of health, accumulates the impure, black blood in the great venous cavities—that is, in the vena cava,—in the vena porta or great vein of the liver, and in all the contiguous venous trunks. Such an engorgement affects the whole of the abdominal viscera and the brain alike—for the jugular veins are as closely connected with the vena cava as any of the veins of the trunk. In autumnal fevers these veins are suddenly and perilously engorged, giving rise to the various symptoms characteristic of that class of diseases. These symptoms indicate that the brain, and all the abdominal viscera are disturbed and more or less interrupted in the performance of their functions.

When the force of the circulation is impaired in a much less

degree, but frequently, and under the influence of causes continually operating, the same engorgement takes place in a proportionate degree, and insensibly increases, the parts adapting themselves gradually and without much immediate disturbance, to this abnormal state, until some chronic disease is firmly established. The most common chronic affection proceeding from this cause, is dyspepsia, with its concurrent train of ills. Among these are nervousness, vertigo, tremors, palpitation of the heart, constipation, diarrhoea, sour or fetid eructations, water-brash, heartburn, general debility, and low spirits. These symptoms do not all appear together or in the same person, but occur indifferently, according to circumstances and to peculiarities of constitution. They all proceed from the same cause, the unnatural turgescence of the venous system of the parts affected with impure blood; thus hindering, or entirely preventing, according to the degree of the evil, the performance of the healthy functions of those parts.

Now let us see how this state gradually creeps upon a clergyman in the active discharge of his duties. 1. Sedentary habits diminish the force of the circulation, as has always been known, although the mode of the action of this cause has been most clearly explained by Liebig. 2. Intense mental action is sure to be followed by a marked diminution in the circulating force. Mental action is far more exhausting than physical action. 3. All excitement above the normal point requires by a self-adjusting law of the economy, a correspondent depression or diminution of force. If this period of depressed vital force could be passed in the quiescent state which is plainly indicated, the healthy standard would gradually be reassumed. If, on the contrary, the system is called upon while in this state for renewed exertions, the evil will be aggravated, and a cause of permanent disease established. The clergyman, beyond any other class of the community, is subject to all these causes of weakened circulation. The sedentary habits and intense mental action of his calling are shared by all students. The high excitement of his Sunday work, recurring at regular weekly intervals, is peculiar to himself. Lawyers are usually exhausted at the end of a term, but then comes a long season of repose and relaxation, and the occasions in which a lawyer is called upon to exert his utmost powers, are rare. The ordinary routine of cases ruffles but little the equable flow of his mind, his spirits, and his temper. But a clergyman is called upon every Sunday at the least, to spend four hours in a state of the highest excitement, in the performance of one of the most arduous, responsible, and difficult of human actions. The corresponding

depression is inevitable. And this result is greatly aggravated by that mysterious tendency of the human system to conform itself to a weekly cycle. After a habit of the body has once been established, the weekly return of the accustomed period will sometimes bring on the condition, even without the usual exciting cause, much more will it increase the action of that cause.

Under the influence of these combined circumstances, the force of the circulation is weakened every week in the case of every clergyman engaged in active duty. Of course there is a corresponding accumulation of impure blood in the great veins of the brain and of the abdominal viscera. At first this is so slight as to attract little or no attention. But the continued operation of the same causes for a series of years, gradually enlarges and diminishes the strength and tone of the venous receptacles. They become permanently distended with an accumulation of the impure venous blood. The exercise of Sunday now produces, for the next day or two, headache, a sense of extreme weariness, and good-for-nothingness. Presently dyspepsia, with more or fewer of its accustomed train of ills, sets in. The first remedy for these accumulating ills usually applied is a resort to stimulants. "A little wine for thy stomach's sake," is the advice of the friend, and the prescription of the physician, fortified by the supposed authority of Holy Writ. The immediate result seems to sanction the judiciousness of the advice. The system is forced up by this adventitious aid to the healthy standard, and the disagreeable symptoms are driven off by the removal of their cause—the venous congestion, i. e. the fever, thus artificially produced, has the same effect as the fever which follows a chill. But this stimulus has been applied to a system already jaded. To continue the same effects, the artificial stimulus must be continually increased. Each present relief is accompanied with a more rapid waste of the vital force by which the circulation is carried on and the organic functions performed. The comfortable feelings of each day are purchased by a corresponding relaxation, and consequent engorgement of the venous system at night. Hence, the discomfort and the disagreeable taste in the mouth with which the sufferer awakes in the morning. At last no amount of stimulus consistent with sobriety will answer the purpose, and we have the broken down minister—the confirmed valetudinarian. A summer at the Springs, acting most happily upon the mind and body together, enables him to go a while longer. When again, if he is sick, or is the Rector of a rich and liberal congregation, a year's travel in Europe and Asia almost restores him to the feelings and to the elasticity of youth.

The *modus operandi* of these health restoring processes is apparent. 1. The remote causes of disease—the sedentary habit, the anxiety, the intellectual exertion, and the mental excitement, are all removed. 2. All mineral springs of any reputation possess a gentle cathartic power, which acting constantly, and without irritation, for eight or ten weeks, gradually removes the venous congestion, by direct action upon the *vena porta*, the great vein of the liver. 3. All the surrounding circumstances are favorable to a maintenance of the whole system, mind and body, in a normal state. The alterative effect of a sea voyage, and all the accompaniments of foreign travel, produce the same result.

But how is this train of evils to be prevented, or their approach retarded? The young men who are principally concerned in this question will hardly regard the subject with sufficient seriousness to heed the answer. That answer is, 1. Obey the law of the Sabbath, that law which requires a day in every week of rest and relaxation from *accustomed* pursuits. 2. Submit to the pathological law which requires that the system over-strained on Sunday, shall be allowed to recover its tone on Monday, by sleep, and rest, and abstinence from food, and pleasant recreation. The transfer by the Clergy of the weekly abstinence from Friday to Monday is very important. For when the stomach is in that state of incipient disease which I have described, to call upon it to perform the active function of digestion upon three full meals is most injurious. All these rules apply to the cure as well as to the prevention of disease. Unfortunately there is but one of them, abstinence, which the clergyman can absolutely command.

But when the *valetudinarian* state has begun, or is established, how is a cure to be effected, and a comfortable degree of health and energy maintained? Dr. Cooke should be hailed as a benefactor by the Clergy and by the whole mighty army of dyspeptics, not only for pointing out the cause of their sufferings, but for indicating the remedy.

The great remedial agent, *in addition to the hygienic rules already mentioned*, is the long continued use of any medicine which will operate directly upon the liver, and discharge the impure contents of the engorged *vena porta*. But it is essential that this should be done gradually and gently. Active purging produces great disturbance of the whole system, weakens the circulation, and thereby increases the disease. So, any medicine which acts upon the mucous membrane of the bowels, and produces watery discharges, increases the debility, and thereby

aggravates the diseased condition. The disease has been gradually formed. It can only be as gradually removed. We must imitate for the dyspeptic at home, as cheaply as possible, the condition of things which he would find at an expensive watering place. There is a class of medicines which operate more immediately upon the liver. The most important of these are Calomel, Aloes, Rhubarb, Colocynth, and Epsom Salts in minute doses. Any of these, or various combinations of the first four, may be used so as to produce at least one and not more than two discharges from the bowels every day. As soon as these medicines begin to operate effectually, those discharges will be dark colored—sometimes nearly black—being principally the disordered secretion of the liver, mingled with the impure and almost unchanged contents of the engorged vena porta. From the day that these discharges are established, relief begins to be felt. Such are the close and intimate relations between the venous trunks, that, to relieve *one* of its superfluous load, is to relieve them all. The brain and the heart, and all the digestive organs, participate in the change. There is a feeling as if a small part of an oppressive load had been taken off. The judicious use of these medicines will produce these same dark colored dejections, and the sensible feeling of relief, just as long as the diseased state—the venous congestion—lasts. This may be two, four, six, or twelve months, according to the inveteracy and previous duration of the diseased condition. As the cure progresses, the discharges become lighter, and when they assume the natural color produced by the yellow bile of a healthy person, the cure is completed, and all the symptoms of disease are at an end.

In speaking of Epsom Salts as acting on the liver, it must be recollected that it only operates in this beneficial way, when used in minute doses, and in minute subdivision, just as we find it in the Epsom Springs which have attained a high reputation for health restoring properties. In doses of the common size the action of this medicine would be very injurious in the class of cases now under consideration. A teaspoonful dissolved in three tumblers of water, one half to be drunk on going to bed at night, and the other on rising in the morning, will be about the proper mode of using it. But this dose must be increased or diminished, so as to produce the effect already indicated. A less effect will not do—a greater will be hurtful. We have used for this purpose the salts evaporated from the water of the Crab Orchard Springs in Kentucky. All alcoholic stimulants must be carefully avoided by the dyspeptic, before and after his cure. As the disease will always be more liable

to recur than to be engendered in the first instance, he must be a watchful guardian of his own condition, and whenever the state of the system requires it resort, for a day or two, or as long as is necessary, to the same means of relief.

Some physicians try to discredit this system, and to sustain the fashionable empiricism of the day, by insisting that these remedies produce the dark colored discharges simply by chemical changes which they effect. There are two sufficient answers to this. 1. The substances mentioned are not capable of producing such effects by chemical changes. 2. They produce these effects just so long as there is the alleged disease to be removed, and no longer.

These are the principles by which Dr. Cooke offers health to the Clergy, and to all dyspeptics. The further elucidation of these principles, and their application to other forms of disease, must be left to the student of his works, and to the wisdom of the profession he adorned. Whenever the members of that learned profession will turn to the forgotten works of this great man, they will find there the materials, which, with the present vastly enlarged knowledge of therapeutic agents, may enable them to build up a firm, deep, and impregnable philosophy of Medicine.

ART. V.—THE CLERGY AND THE WORLD.

THERE is a singular perverseness in men, which will not allow them to regard the Clergy in any wise as they do their lay brethren. Most people treat their Minister as one far off from them; and, when associating with him, put off their every day manner, for one constrained, and quite as bashful as respectful. If this were merely in honor to his sacred calling, it might be well enough; but it is not so. It is rather the constraint of those who are in strange company; and has much of the sharp curiosity which is apt to beset men among unaccustomed objects.

The true position of a Clergyman among the Laity can be marked by no precise rules, as his intercourse with them must, in some measure, be guided by the congeniality or strangeness which he may find in their company. He will seek his friends as other men do. But, in the wide region of common courtesy and free intercourse, the people themselves often set at nought all efforts he may make to become at his ease with them. And there are many vulgar notions respecting the Clergy—vulgar in every sense—which create much evil, and which should be removed. These notions, however, are in some degree due to the Clergy themselves.

That every one invested with this sacred Office should be pre-eminently a gentleman, few will question. The conduct of a true gentleman is but an embodiment of genuine Christian charity; and no one should surpass in it those whose lives are, or ought to be, guided steadily by its rules. But daily experience teaches us that the address of Clergymen is often frigid and distant to an unpleasant degree, when among strangers or those who are not on terms of intimacy with them. And this manner is assumed as the proper one, for a man whose duty it is to be not of the world, although he may be in it. While not designedly done with a Pharisaical spirit, it has marvelously the same appearance, and is therefore undeservedly credited with such a fault.

The result of this appears in those sermons which deal with sins as abstractions, and, week after week, rebuke covetousness, pride, and other monstrous vices, in the most zealous manner, and draw from the whole congregation expressions of admiration for their truth and earnestness, but leave the individual sin-

ner untouched. All men are ready to decry any sin, and all recognize its enormity; but the deceitfulness of the heart keeps them from seeing their own features in its ugly countenance, unless plainly pointed out. But how can the preacher depict what he has never seen? The restraint of his presence not only keeps down the manifestations of evil dispositions, but banishes conversation on the topics which engross most worldly minds; and instead of the honestly expressed views and opinions of those whom he meets, he hears but the common phrases of civility, more precise and common-place than usual. He sees no misconduct, therefore, except among those who are thoroughly degraded. It is true he hears of a good deal. He hears the outpourings of talebearers and scandal mongers, who perform their duties by earnestly bewailing the sins of their neighbors, and in the process make them worthy of bewailing. And he cannot either utter silence or disregard these reports. When he preaches, as he ought, with a view to reach the consciences of those who, as he supposes, are guilty of some especial besetting sin, he is therefore often entirely mistaken; and seeing no change, he puts down as willful hardness of heart, what is nothing of the kind. Unless he has a perilous gift of oratory, which calls forth admiration and applause, he is grieved, as months roll on, to see so few touched by his probing, and repentant at his chiding. He bewails his own weakness, and mourns over the barren soil he is set to till. And barren indeed the soil remains, till some new laborer, with the advantages of novelty, for a time accomplishes a little, and then fails like his predecessor. Both accomplish what they do by random shots, and such will be sure to hit some wrongdoer in a sensitive place. But such is not the most profitable manner of preaching the Gospel.

No man can overcome evil, without knowing its manifestations. As they vary with every new trick of deception, he should be able to trace them through their windings, and detect them in all their disguises. This he can only do by seeing them. The ways of men are not learned through books alone, any more than the mechanic arts, or any other skillful work. Daily intercourse and constant observation are the only methods for learning man as he is, with all his imperfections and contradictions. The Clergyman, like any other person, must get knowledge at that school where it is taught.

But this is deemed very unsafe practice by many, who, with over precision, regard all contact with the world as contaminating. And it must be confessed that this opinion is a very prevalent one. But what sort of sanctity is that which is de-

stroyed by the first touch of an erring fellow mortal? We are told that to be in the world yet not of it is the duty of the Christian. But what does this mean? Surely not that he should hold no intercourse with the world. Not that he should never be *in* the world at all. It is doubtless sinful to indulge in forbidden pleasures, but all pleasures are not sinful. It is likewise sinful to follow many pursuits from which pleasure is entirely absent. But to meet on terms of courtesy all with whom he may be thrown in contact, and to show them the beauty of Christian charity, as well as the honesty of Christian principle, can never contaminate any one.

"He that has light within his own clear breast
May sit i' th' centre, and enjoy bright day;
But he that hides a dark soul, and foul thoughts,
Benighted walks under the midday sun;
Himself is his own dungeon."

This mistaken nicety is doing much, especially in our new settlements, to cast odium on the Ministers of the Church; and neither eloquence nor learning can do away with its evil effect. The rough freedom of manners and opinions prevailing is entirely antagonistic to any such weakness. Nowhere is an upright Clergyman more honored or respected for his firmness and consistency; but there are no keener critics of human nature than the settlers in a new country, and none more ready to detect mistaken notions of it. If the preacher betrays any greenness on this subject, and spends his time in belaboring sins that are not the peculiar failings of pioneers, he can hope for no great influence over his hearers or the community. They honor him for what he has, but do not recognize in him the guide and teacher they need. Plain and sound sense goes further with them than any flowers of rhetoric. They expect a leader to excel them in all that belongs to his calling, and also to be able to do his part in moulding the features of society. An old community, past the transition state, can get along with less difficulty. But, in a place where all are moving on, every leader must be able to hold his own, and keep in advance of the main body.

And if it be the object of the Ministry to call sinners to repentance, how are they to be called? Not, surely, by keeping aloof from them. The founders of our Faith went out daily among the people in the first beginnings of their Ministry. They preached to the unbelieving Jews, but they followed up their preaching by reasonings and less formal teachings. They did not keep aloof from the Gentiles, but among them, and in daily intercourse with them, they reached their stubborn hearts. And they preached to the needs of their hearers. St. Paul, on

the Areopagus, did not address the Greeks as he did the Jews in Palestine. To the Jews he became as a Jew, and to the Greeks as a Greek;—all things to all men. But, because he adapted himself to the tastes of the Greek, he did not assume the Greek vices. He gave them an example of what a Greek should be when purged of those vices, and embracing a purer faith. He did not regard the best gifts of genius as unworthy a Christian because possessed by a heathen; but rather sought to turn them, by applying them to better uses, to the honor and glory of God. And the wise pastor, who goes among a people full of earnestness, and crowding with cheerful and bold hearts in the rough road of material advancement, instead of turning sadly from them as hard followers of Mammon, should step manfully into the press, and with stout effort shoulder them, if need be, into the narrow way. Let him show himself *a man* that he may gain men.

In looking abroad among the Clergy who have succeeded in building up strong parishes, and those who have failed, we cannot but notice how closely their career resembles that of men in secular pursuits. The merchant who brings goods unsuited to the market, fails, though their quality be perfect, and their prices all that could be desired. The lawyer, who cannot make the principles of the law fit the advancing wants of the age, and who walks *per antiquas vias legis*, over brush and corduroy, when others take the rail, is condemned to the delusion that the modern Courts are all astray, while he only is right. And the minister who bestows prize-essay learning and metaphysical crotchets upon hearers who are in the habit of walking across lots to their point, instead of traveling orderly on the windings of the King's highway, is apt to have his labor for his pains. One of the most successful parish Clergymen we know anywhere, who has raised up into prosperity and energy some of the most unpromising Churches to be found, would be very far from obtaining commendation for pulpit eloquence. But, with a mild and benevolent disposition, joined to an unfailing fund of shrewd common sense, and quiet perseverance, he makes men respect him for his virtue and plain wisdom, and gives them confidence in his undertakings for the Church, because he shows sound judgment in other matters. If a man dazzles them with a sparkling discourse, admirable for everything but its fitness to their case, they are apt, when he proposes to build or enlarge a Church edifice, and exhibits his plans and calculations, to hesitate at giving him their full confidence. But if when he is out of the pulpit, they find cause to respect his character and capacity, so that they would honor him though he were not their

pastor, they will not only follow him in his plans, but they will find appreciation for very ordinary sermons. A man respected for his solid qualities is safe enough anywhere. Instances of the best ministerial success under difficulties could be readily pointed to, (were it not for provoking invidious comparisons,) and in each case there will be found some quality demanding the respect of all sorts of people, and improved by daily contact with them. A genial and affable temper, a plain straightforward honesty of speech and dealing, public spirit and enterprise—in short, some quality which will make its possessor a *useful member of society*—will never injure him for teaching religion. If he can exhibit to his flock, an example of how Christian graces may guide and purify worldly wisdom, his precepts will be far more honored.

It has always been remarked, that the Jesuit missionaries have usually had good success in establishing missions; and, if their missions have not been permanent, the fault is to be found in the system, and not in the qualifications of those who carry it out. It would be well if the good parts of their scheme were adopted by us; for in our own method we are sadly deficient. If we compare the course through which a young man enters parochial or missionary duty in our Church, with that which they go through with, the advantage in training, is clearly with them.

What would be thought of our Naval System, if a lad, after going through a Naval School, were to be placed at once in command of a ship of the line, before making a cruise? Yet this is, practically, what we do every day in the Church. A boy goes to College at the age of fourteen or fifteen, and at eighteen or nineteen graduates. If he has been intended for the Ministry, he may probably pass his College course in some institution, where sound learning and sound morals are cultivated, away from intercourse with the world;—and well for him if such has been his good fortune. He comes forth crowned with the laurel for his proficiency in the liberal Arts, among which a knowledge of mankind is not usually counted. Fresh from his studies, which have only qualified him for going to work, he enters a Theological Seminary, wherein is taught all proper doctrine, and likewise much discipline for the pulpit, but very little else. What is taught is good; but what is omitted is not all wisely omitted. At the end of his course he is ordained a deacon, licensed to preach, and sent as a Missionary to the West. He preaches sound and godly sermons, but not always practical; devotes himself honestly and earnestly to *flice*, as he understands them; and wonders

at the small results which follow his efforts, and pities the heathenish darkness of the people. He is not entirely wrong in estimating his success, for he cannot always see much fruit of his labors; although from being over-sanguine he becomes frequently over-desponding. He is often entirely wrong about his people; for they are the same race who dwell in the old States, and are not unmindful of the requirements of religion. Why does he meet with such disappointments? Partly from not knowing, and partly from regarding as worldly matters unbecoming a minister, many things which are necessary to the well being of the community. He visits the farmer, and cannot converse with him on any of his familiar topics, or relish conversation on them. Of the current political news of the day he is often studiously ignorant, because politics are notoriously an unclean pursuit. He visits a household where some member of the family, old or young, has met with an accident, or been taken suddenly ill, and, if appealed to for advice or assistance, is unable to give either. He visits the poverty-stricken with alms and sympathy; but cannot bestow such counsel as will aid them in making the most of their little means. He is asked advice concerning the disposition of property, perhaps on a death-bed, and can say nothing. In short, while by his sacred Office he is expected to be the general guide, counselor and friend, he is deficient in the essential qualifications.

The Jesuits do not neglect teaching the useful Arts. An acquaintance not superficial, but complete as far as it goes, with Medicine, Science, Languages, Agriculture and Mechanics, and the general principles of Law most likely to be of service, as well as the forms and rules of business, will be found very commonly among those missionary priests who are entrusted with cures of any importance. It is by such accomplishments that they obtain respect and influence among men, far more than by their dialectics. In the latter, wherein they follow the logic of the cloister, they are always sure to betray the disagreeable peculiarities of their system by the habitual use of puerile sophisms, effectual only with the ignorant and credulous. We have ourselves seen the readiness of these men to act in cases of emergency, where the nature of the accident was such as to baffle even a skillful physician; and the wisdom and common sense of the French priests who formerly had pastoral supervision of the Northwest, have always been known and appreciated. Their successors are not so accomplished, but they have a different work to do, and a different people to deal with than the simple and genial Frenchman.

We cannot but regard it as a great defect in our system that

more of this practical training is not found among our Clergy. It would not only add to their worldly wisdom, but would enable them to benefit their neighbors and parishioners. And—(which some, however, may not approve)—it would aid them in providing for themselves and their families more comforts, and render them more independent of “starvation-point” salaries half paid. It does not follow, of necessity, because a man learns to use the saw and plane, that he should take up the trade of a carpenter; nor because he has some knowledge of any other art, that he should devote himself to it. No knowledge comes amiss to a man of sense; and the disparagement which befalls a jack of all trades is undeserved, unless he is a master of none, and therefore has spent time on one which was needed for another. How far it is practicable, or convenient, for a parish Clergyman or Missionary to enter upon any secular trade or occupation, is a question deserving more time and space than a page in a desultory paper; but, having the example of St. Paul, who wrought diligently night and day to earn his own living, that he might not be chargeable to his flock, we believe there is a false etiquette on this subject which keeps many Clergymen miserably poor, and keeps many Churches destitute entirely of clerical supervision. We respectfully commend the consideration of this topic to those who are discussing the subject of “Free Churches.”

Squeamishness is a vice very prevalent in this country, and there seems to be a great uneasiness about compromising the conventional dignity of station. Strange as it may appear, there is far more of this among ourselves than exists among the best society in England. Far be it from any one to undervalue a demeanor and course of life which not only receive, but extort from all, profound respect. But to encourage shallow-pated pretension to lay down iron rules for the conduct of the Ministry, and to starve it into genteel poverty; for no better recompense than a bland condescending approbation of the rigid propriety with which this etiquette is obeyed, is carrying obedience to worldly maxims entirely too far. It would astonish a dignitary of the Church of England, to be rebuked for farming or improving lands, or for owning a share in some flourishing factory. And it would seem equally strange to him to be told that, while his money was invested there, he should not keep an eye to its management. The English Clergy have in many noble instances been renowned for discoveries in science, and for well-directed labors in advancing the material interests of the community. It will not be found that these men, any more than the few of our own Clergy who have done

the same thing, have been for that reason remiss in their religious duties. But here, while we find fault with the ignorance of many of our Clergy on business matters, we at the same time find fault if they attend to business. We smile at their simplicity, and yet are shocked to see them civil to their neighbors, who have not the Shibboleth. And our tender care of them extends to their minds as well as their manners. Some of us are more horrified by the blooming out of a parson's imagination in sweet verse, or sparkling prose, which is not plainly didactic, than we should be to see him walking abroad with the small-pox. The Rector of Eversley, (who has in such vigorous English endeavored to point out that true religion should make men perform better everything they are called upon to do, and is purer and more sincere from union with active duties,) is looked at askance as a dangerous man, because he dramatizes his sermons, and thus is enabled to preach to larger congregations. And wo to the American divine whose pen drops honey, for he is sure to draw the wasps.

We have wandered over our ground without much regard to strict method. And, in what we have said, we design no ungracious reflections on any of the Clergy. They are eminently devoted and self-denying; and they desire to promote the honor of God and the good of men. But we believe they are too often called upon to labor a lifetime, to retrieve the disadvantages of imperfect—because partial—training, and to give up many opportunities for doing good, from mistaken notions in themselves and their people of what is becoming to the ministerial Office. And we have evidence enough, in those who have won the respect of men of all classes, by the union of Christian graces with useful knowledge, that the character of a pastor is never the worse for any part of manliness.

ART. VI.—FREE SEATS!—OR PEWS!

FREE Seats and Pews have long been struggling together in the Church; and to many, the contest, even in argument, seems yet to be doubtful.

There has been, on the one side, perhaps an overstraining of particular principles; or too much of mere reliance on the private interpretation of some text of Scripture; or a somewhat curt dogmatism in assuming, as indisputable, the very point to be proved. On the other, there has been so great a quantity of dust thrown into the air, that it is difficult, at first, to distinguish between a Church and an auction-room; between an offering and a purchase; between giving an alms and paying rent. Yet when the matter is carefully reduced down to that which is of the *essence of the difference*, it will be found so plain, that the only wonder is, how Christian men, and sensible men, could ever raise any contest about it.

The first thing needful is, to disentangle the question from side issues, and considerations which may, indeed, (and most happily do,) modify the pew system as commonly carried out among us; but which have nothing to do with the *comparative* merits of the two systems, because they *belong equally to both*.

Thus it will not do for the advocate of Pews to urge, that frequently it is *not all* the pews that are rented; or, that a certain portion has been reserved by the Vestry as *Free Seats*. This will not do, we say; for the *principle* of renting covers the *whole*. The character of the Church as a "pewed Church" still remains. Probably the only reason a part is free, is because renters enough for all have not yet been found. And at any rate, the permanence of the arrangement is utterly unreliable. The vestry may at any time, by a majority vote, sell or rent the whole.

Besides—it is no argument for Pewed Churches, *as against Free Churches*, to say that, in the former, "*part* of the seats are free." Instead of an argument for Pewed Churches, this is really a fatal concession to their opponents; for if it be so good a thing to have a *part* of the seats free, *how much better to have the whole?* And again. If any particular proportion of seats in a Pewed Church are free—say one third—it is no argument against a Free Church: for in a Free Church, one-third of the seats are free also. Where there is no difference, there is no

thing gained on either side, and nothing is to be argued either way. The *real difference* is to be found in the *remaining two-thirds*, all of which are *free* on the one side, and *every one* of which is *sold or rented* on the other. This plea in abatement, so loudly urged by the advocates of Pews, must therefore be at once ruled out of Court. It is rather too much to expect that the Free Church system will consent to be struck down by *its own thunder*,—and *stolen at that*.

The modified practice dilutes the evils of the pew system, we grant, and thus renders its ordinary form as existing among us, somewhat less injurious. But the general admission of any such dilution is itself a general confession, on the part of these very Pewed Churches, that the evils of their own system were intolerable without it. And their borrowing the remedy from the Free Church plan, is a confession that they *know* very well where to look for the best cure. In arguing, therefore, the comparative merits of the two principles of action, we must go upon the undeniable ground that *all* the seats in Pewed Churches are, or may be, *rented or sold*, just as in Free Churches, they are *all free*.

Again: There is no distinction worthy of the name of *principle*, to be taken between seats sold and seats rented. The former is *practically* much the worse of the two. But they are identical in essence. They differ only as the small pox and the varioloid differ. The latter is merely the milder and more manageable form of the disease.

Again: When we come to the question of the Offertory, and the duty of *giving*, as therein enjoined, it will not do to point to the large "plate collections" made in Pewed Churches on communion occasions, and for various Church or benevolent objects: for *these things are likewise done in precisely the same manner in Free Churches*. Their being done to some extent in Pewed Churches, is therefore no argument *against* the Free. It is only as before, an *unwitting concession*. For if it be good to raise a *part* of Church funds on these high and Scriptural grounds, how much *better* to raise *the whole* in that manner? *And Free Churches thus raise the whole*. This is only another specimen of the old trick:—taking an admirable, practical feature from those whom they are opposing, and then immediately turning round and using it as a weapon *against* the very system from which it was "borrowed."

Again: It is urged that "courtesy is always sure to give a seat to those who have no pews. Is "courtesy" confined to Pewed Churches? Is there no courtesy in Free Churches? Besides: That courtesy, as we all know from experience, cannot

always be relied on to make strangers at home in seats paid for by other people. It cannot safely be depended on even for well-dressed strangers—*gentlemanly* strangers—nay, nor yet for handsome and fashionable-looking "*ladies*." And the meanly-clad poor? Let *them try it*, if they think there is invariable "*courtesy*" for *them*! They will soon find out their mistake! But even granting that "*courtesy*" occasionally, or even frequently, is found in Pewed Churches, and makes strangers "*feel at home*:" what argument is that *against* Free Churches, where that delightful "*courtesy*" is not left to depend upon the momentary caprice of individuals, but is the fundamental *law of the whole House*? If Christian "*courtesy*" is thus charming on a small scale, what must it be when made universal, so that *every* stranger may at *all* times "*feel himself at home*" in *any* seat he pleases?—Or is this "*courtesy*," in Pewed Churches, valued, like diamonds, *only because of its rarity*?—Here, again, it will be seen that the Pew-system has been compelled to steal another small pinch of Free Church salt, in order to give even the semblance of a savor to its own utter insipidity.

We do not wonder, indeed, at such adroit tactics. Realizing so thoroughly as we do, what a miserable, stale crust this vaunted pew system is, we do not wonder that its advocates cannot resist the temptation to purloin a little somewhat more toothsome to make their dry bread go down. Nor, considering the spirit in which their favorite system originated, are we at all surprised when we find them, like economical boarding-house keepers, spreading this sweet butter *as thin as possible*, to see if they cannot make a very little of it go a great way. All this, we say, occasions us no surprise. Their sapless system needs it so intensely, that the craving is irresistible. Indeed, they never consider themselves now-a-day as fit to be seen, except when they have covered their dust-colored coat with so many fresh-looking, Free Church patches, that they have great hope of preventing any discovery of the mean and coarse cloth it was originally made of.

But in fairly carrying on the contest between these two antagonistic systems, no such mixings and borrowings can be tolerated on the field of equal and honorable warfare. One champion has no business to come upon the ground buckrammed and padded out to imposing proportions, by what he has cribbed from his opponent on the sly. The contending principles on each side must be *stripped to the bare buff*, if we wish to see anything like *fair play*.

We therefore discard altogether the plea of "*part free*;" or, of "*large offertory collections*;" or, of "*individual courtesy*:"

as urged by the advocates of pews. These have no business in the controversy whatever, *except as virtual, and important, and overwhelming concessions in favor of the Free Church plan*: for these features, thus "borrowed" from that Free Church plan, are the only things that make the ugly face of the pew system tolerable, even to its own best friends.

Stripped to things essential, then, the two opposing schemes may be thus stated:—

The Free Church plan offers the preaching of the Gospel *free to all*. It asks no one to contribute for the "support of the Church," except such as have first *heard and received* the Gospel. It asks them to give *then*, only from their *faith* in God, their *hope* of Heaven, and their *love* both towards the Lord Jesus who hath given unto them salvation, and towards their brethren who are one with them in Him. And the standard of "how much" each one shall give, is no other than that which Holy Scripture has set forth,—"*according as he is able*." In other words: the *free hearing* of the Gospel is a condition *precedent* to the duty of "*supporting the Church*;" and the *measure of that duty* is *God's Word*.

The pew system, on the other hand, does not offer the Gospel free to any; but furnishes it only to those who have paid for the privilege. It asks a certain rent for the "support of the Church," and asks it, not from Christian, but from commercial considerations, the seat being worth just as much "rent" to the Church whether its occupant love God or not. The standard "how much" each shall pay, is regulated solely by the prominence, convenience for seeing and hearing, and general "eligibility," of the pew, having nothing whatever to do with the "ability" of the giver. In other words: the *paying* for the "*support of the Church*," is a condition *precedent*, without which no man can expect to *hear the preaching of the Gospel*; and the *measure of that duty* is regulated by *the world*.

These are the points in which the two systems meet and contradict one another. And therefore it is within these limits, and on these grounds, and no other, that the contest between them must be fought out. In the above statement and definition, we have neither inserted anything outside the essential antagonistic issues, nor omitted anything important to their full comprehension. We have, it is true, given rather a large margin to the Pew-system, out of mere kindness. We shall be compelled to pare it much closer down to the quick, before we get through; but this will do to begin on.

Let us first try the question *historically*, relying upon the

saying of the wise man, "*The thing that hath been, it is that which shall be.*"

When the Holy Ghost descended on the day of Pentecost, and the Apostles preached with tongues, and gathered in the first fruits of full grown Christianity, we find not a syllable in St. Peter's Sermon about the "duty of supporting the Church," as if that was the first thing to be provided for: but the *Resurrection of Christ Crucified* was the element of power with which his hearers were pricked to the heart. And when the converts said, "Men and Brethren, what shall we do?" the answer was not,—*"We have sittings in our Upper Room, which we are about to rent. It is your duty to take pews there, at so much a year, that each one of you may keep his own family from contact with any other family during time of Divine Worship. And we will also have 'respect of persons,' so that the differences of your position in the world, may be carefully perpetuated in the Church. The richer, therefore, shall have the best seats, at the highest price; and the poorer shall have those not so desirable, at a lower price. Moreover, if we cannot rent the whole, there will be a few of the worst seats next the door, which may be occupied by paupers, and where they can hear the Gospel without money and without price."* The Apostles, on the day of Pentecost, said nothing like this. If they had, the Gospel would have fallen still-born, at the hour of its birth, and would never have been heard of after. Yet, on the Pew-system, this is substantially the first proclamation made when a new Church is built. The Consecration of the House of God is scarcely over,—the sound of the voice of the *successor of those Apostles who Preached on the day of Pentecost* has scarcely ceased to echo under its roof,—when the lay auctioneer enters, hammer in hand, and knocks down the seats to the highest bidder.

Nevertheless, the Church in Jerusalem was "supported," although it had not the aid of the Pew-system, which is now thought to be so indispensable. For several years the whole College of the Apostles abode there, and gave themselves wholly to the ministry of the Word and to Prayer; many of the Elders were also permanently laboring there; while seven Deacons were appointed and maintained besides, and employed more or less as Missionaries and Evangelists through all the region round; and large companies of "widows," moreover, both of Greeks and Hebrews, were daily ministered unto out of the treasury of the Church. No such powerful financial system has ever since been devised. Distribution was made to *every man*, according as he had need. And the Church grew. The

Lord added thereto *daily* such as should be saved. In a very brief space of time the number of them that believed was about *five thousand*. Now we would like to ask a question:—How long would it take for a parish of an hundred and twenty members to grow to *five thousand*, supporting *Twelve* Apostles, a *large company* of Elders, and *seven* Deacons, besides distributing to all the needy,—*on the Pew-system*?

This wonderful growth of the Church in Jerusalem is an epitome of Church growth everywhere else, and ever since. Never, on the face of the whole earth, has the Gospel of the Lord Jesus Christ *first* bargained for a temporal maintenance, and *then* proceeded to minister unto the souls of the perishing the treasures of heavenly Grace. Throughout all the Roman Empire the voice of *Free* Grace was freely heard. Whether in the Jewish Synagogues, or the open market place, or the upper chamber, or the private hired house, or the lonely seashore, the unbroken law of *freedom* was everywhere the same. And it was in a great measure *because* the millstone of Mammon was *not* hanged about the neck of the glorious Gospel, that its innumerable enemies were utterly unable to drown it in the depths of the sea. From city to city it ran, with unshackled, mysterious, electrical speed. Province after province was overrun with the sacred contagion. No tax nor tariff checked its course from mouth to mouth, from heart to heart. Even the enormous boundaries of the Roman Empire were not enough to exhaust its energy of conquest; but it overflowed on all sides, and carried the rivers of salvation afar off into places inaccessible to Roman arms, making the wildernesses and solitary places of barbarism to blossom as the rose. Not alone during the lives of Apostles, during the ages of miracles, during the bloody seed-time of martyrdoms and pagan persecutions, was this the universal mode of the growth of the Gospel throughout the nations. Even during the gathering darkness of the Middle Ages, this grand old inviolable Tradition of Christianity was handed down from century to century, uncontaminated by the touch of filthy lucre. Whether obscurely exploring the vast labyrinths of Tartaric tribes in the interior of Asia, or winning a wide yet transient domain in the Flowery Empire, or breaking the coarse idols of the English Saxons, or subduing the rough Gothic tribes of Europe, or softening the more fiery hordes of Sarmatian blood, or lighting up the gloom of the black forests of Germany, or melting the savagery of Scandinavian sea-kings, or fertilizing deeply the cold clay of Russian serfdom: everywhere the same invariable watchword has invariably led the warriors of the Cross to victory. The

preaching of the Gospel was *free to all comers*. No price was ever charged anywhere in the whole world, as *first* to be paid, *before* the preaching of the Gospel should be even *heard*. Rich or poor, Jew or heathen, publican, heretic, hypocrite or harlot—all were welcome to come and hear the words of life, without first *hiring a pew*.

"But," it may be said, "times and men have changed since then. That plan did well enough in those countries and for those ages of the world. But the Nineteenth Century needs a different mode of proceeding, and men must now be wrought upon by different and more practical methods."

Our appeal, be it remembered, is now not so much to principles in the abstract, as to the *actual history of the Church*. We are arguing, not on private interpretation of Scriptural texts, nor on philosophical considerations, nor on theoretical hypotheses. *We are building only upon notorious and indisputable facts.*

And on the ground of notorious *fact*, this alleged "change of times and circumstances," we boldly deny. It is no such thing. The phrase is empty—it is a mere delusion and a snare. For how is the Gospel propagated in this our day? Where has it spread at all, with a solid and *bona fide* growth? Let us look closely at it and see.

During this Nineteenth Century thus far, the Gospel has made conquests of no small magnitude in India, in Africa (both on the West coast and at the Cape,) in New Zealand, in Australia, and in these United States, besides a most wonderful revival within these twenty years in England. If we go beyond the bounds of our own communion, and somewhat further back than the opening of this century, we find the great phenomenon of Methodism sweeping onward with a breadth and force truly astonishing, the Whitefield revival, the rapid rise of the Baptists, the successful missions of various bodies of Dissenters in India, in Burmah, in the Sandwich Islands and those of the South Pacific, and elsewhere. *What had the Pew-system to do with any one of these?* Did Wesley make people pay pew rent *before* he would allow them a chance to be "converted?" Are East Indians first required to pay for the support of Missionaries, *before* they are persuaded to destroy their hideous idols, and turn to the living God? Are the dusky New Zealanders, or the coal-black Africans, *first* brought up to the contribution-box, *before* the Gospel has taught them to "repent and be baptized for the remission of sins?" All these senseless absurdities are necessarily involved in the Pew-system, which requires people to *pay* (or promise to pay) *beforehand* a cer-

tain price, after which, and in consideration of which, they are entitled to hear "the stated preaching of the Gospel."

Nor is the Church movement in England, or the spread of the Church in this country, any exception to the universal experience of all the rest of Christendom. One great leading feature of the movement in England,—one chief element of its power, and of its success—has been its deadly hostility to the Pew-system, and the remorseless and unflinching war which it has waged with pews, and pew sales and pew rents, in every varied form of the abomination. The measure of popular growth among the masses has been in direct proportion with the successes gained in this war against the heartless exclusiveness of pews. Without this, that movement would have been strangled in its infancy. With it,—that is with this large *destruction* of the Pew-system—the Church of England has grown more, in numbers, church buildings, schools, and voluntary offerings of all sorts, for all purposes ecclesiastical and benevolent, foreign and domestic,—she has grown incomparably more, we say, in *twenty-five years*, than in the *three hundred years previous*.

In these United States, the Church has spread very rapidly, indeed, though not near so rapidly as she might have done on a more scriptural, more sensible, and more powerful plan. The Pew-system has prevailed to a very general extent, in almost every quarter of our land. In some Dioceses the common rule has been to sell the pews in fee, so that they might pass, like so much bank stock, into the hands of schismatics, heretics, or even infidels. Such owners charge rent to the occupants of their pews, but pocket the whole as they would the rent of a house. Not a cent of it goes to the "support of the Church:" the minister's salary, meanwhile, being paid by voluntary subscription. In other, and the more numerous, cases, the less injurious mode of annual renting has been preferred. The *dilutions* we have spoken of have also very extensively been resorted to, thus giving much more of life to the total than the Pew-system could ever rightly claim as its own. And yet our *growth* has been sadly hindered. The Church has often, through large sections, felt the tone of her system somehow impaired, and has suffered severely without knowing or suspecting what it is that hurts her. Look at the veteran time-honored citadels of the Pew-system,—the old and old-fashioned pewed Churches—how hard and dry they are! There is no more elasticity, life or growth in them, than in an ancient oyster-shell. They can run on in the old ruts, but they are perfectly certain that ruin will overtake the Church, if those old ruts

should ever be departed from. These are not the Parishes, nor are such the men, to lead the van of the Church's conquests. No. After waiting year after year until our very souls are weary,—and waiting in vain,—for such men to *move on*: it is at length agreed, on all hands, that not among the old pewed churches, but in its *Mission-work* is the true *Life of the Church*. The time for the moving in the Valley of Dry Bones, is not yet.

And what is the operation of *Life* in this Mission-work? How does it act? By what method is the Church *first started* in a *new* place? Do men begin with the Pew-system full fledged? They are not such fools. Arrangements are invariably made whereby the multitude of strangers to the Church may first attend freely. There is not a lisp about pew-rent. Seldom is even the plate passed round *after* preaching. *Free seats* are the lure, whereby to get men to come within the sound of the preacher's voice. *Free seats* are relied on to fill the room; and without them, a beggarly account of empty benches would be the sole reward of the admirer of pews.

True, it is too generally the case, that when a good beginning has been made on the Free system, the congregation, of its own accord, adopts the other. *That* part of the question we shall consider presently. We only wish to show *now* that the beginning is made, and must be made, invariably on the *free* plan. Take, for instance, a case mentioned only a few weeks ago in the *Episcopal Recorder*. Christ Church, Dupont's Mills, Delaware, was started in 1851, and has now one hundred communicants. An humble school-house has all this while served them for a church,—*seats free*, of course. They have now completed a beautiful Gothic stone Church, 120 feet long, with a spire 140 feet high, and a fine organ, &c. All this has been done in *five years*, with *free seats*. Now, however, the people are so eager for pews, that they were nearly all taken before the Church was completed. The *Recorder*, with strange unconsciousness of the bearing of its words, remarks upon this case, that, "Without in any degree shaking our confidence in the *free* system as the *first stage in a missionary enterprise*, it seems to indicate, with an unusual degree of clearness, the period in which it seems desirable to change the *free* into a *pewed church*." The *Recorder* is too profound for us to fathom its occult philosophy of what is "desirable." To our common-sense way of looking at things, it would seem that a system which had gained 100 communicants and built a beautiful stone Church, in five years, to *begin with*, was precisely the best system in the world to *go on with*. But more of this here-

after. We here have at least the broad admission that the "free system" is the true plan for "the first stage in a Missionary enterprise;" that is, that the "free system" is the *only system* upon which *true Missionary work can be effectively carried on at all*.

The uncontradicted voice of all history and all experience, Primitive, Mediaeval, Modern, European, American, is therefore this, that in carrying forward Christianity, men are not to be expected, or asked, to *pay in advance* for the Gospel, in order that thus it may be preached to them; but that, to gain any sure foothold anywhere, it must first be *preached FREE*. And this is equally true everywhere, and in all places, and in all ages, from the day of Pentecost in Jerusalem, down to the farthest western settlement in these United States, in the middle of this nineteenth century; or to the remotest islands in the South Sea.

Having now found what the *Facts of History* tell us about Free Seats, let us consult the same incorruptible oracle about Pews.

We imported the system from England. Occasionally, from about the time of the Reformation or a little before, the Lord of the Manor, on building a Church all by himself, and retaining the patronage in his own hands, would erect a large pew in a prominent position, for his own family; leaving, however, all the rest of the Church perfectly free, as of ancient and universal custom. When Puritanism began to prevail, and men were willing neither to bow in the creed nor kneel in the prayers, they began to build the backs and sides of Church seats very high, that these indulgences of stiff-necks and stubborn-knees might pass undiscovered. As sermons were also of very wearisome length in those days, these new-fangled boxes were admirably contrived, so that, during the discourse, the whole congregation might sink down behind the tall pew-backs into invisibility and slumber. The exclusiveness of this system more and more shut out the masses from the Parish Church. The wealthiest and most respectable families had possession of the pews—the respectability of the family being generally measured by the size of the great pew, and the amount of lumbering furniture, stove, table, settees, and stools, which it contained. The system grew harder and harder, the more it flourished. The great body of the excluded were too ignorant to know that all this was a violation of English law; and too poor, and of too little social consideration, to be able to enforce their legal rights, even if they had known them. The ale-house and the cock-fight, therefore, were the only Sunday solace for *them*, until some ranting

Dissenter came along, holding forth by the roadside—*where there were no pews*; or in the "Chapel," or "Bethesda," or "Ebenezer," *where all the seats were free*: and thus stole away the hearts of the people from the Church of their fathers!

So far, the results of this miserable innovation—this shameless usurpation, this misbegotten spawn of spiritual pride and social superciliousness—were only evil, and that continually. The clergy were supported, not by pews, but by tithes; and whether their churches were full of worshipers, or only full of pews, made little difference in their income. As for those who had pews, they, of course, paid nothing for the privilege, the Churches being, *by law*, free to all. A new refinement was, the idea of *renting seats for money*. This was of course illegal in the parish Churches, but it was practicable in proprietary Chapels—that is, Chapels which were the private property of one or more individuals. These Chapels, if served by a clergyman who was popular enough as a preacher to draw large congregations, were found to be a good speculation. The pew-rents would suffice to pay the minister, and the current expenses, and a handsome per centage on the invested capital besides. This unhappy development *doubly riveted all the mischief of the former abuse*. It made the *income of the Clergy* depend upon the pew system, thus making them interested in continuing it: and besides that, it made the people feel that they were not merely illegal "squatters" and usurpers of other persons' rights; but it gave them the proud consciousness that they had "paid" for their seats, and had "a legal right" to get "the worth of their money" in return. This of course made them even less likely to grant, than the Clergy were to ask, a change.

And such is the shape in which the evil has become general among us. Its supposed financial certainty and convenience; its facility for keeping families together; its securing a *quid pro quo*, as the something gained for a man's own self in return for the amount he gives to the Church; all these are urged, and urged powerfully, by clergy and by laity, in its behalf.

The certainty is imaginary: for the pew-rent is as likely to be in arrear as any other Church money—so experience testifies. But at any rate, the Church has always been more liberal on the right system than the wrong, and is even now ready to become so again, as we shall show presently.

Its convenience is a deceptive plea, as hundreds of parish treasurers can tell, who from the unpleasant reminiscences of years know how much more laborious, and in every way disagreeable, it is to dun delinquents for unpaid pew-rent, than simply to carry the Alms-basin round on Sunday morning.

Its facility for keeping families together is a Euphuistic deception. It means in reality, that the hiring a pew of one's own renders punctuality unnecessary ; and enables a man, with wife and children, to make a most irreverent and inexcusable irruption into the congregation in the midst of public worship, and yet be perfectly certain that their pew will be *kept empty for them until they arrive*. It is very rarely that, on coming to Church betimes, a family of moderate size will find any difficulty in securing seats together. And for the few times during the year when it may be otherwise, what is the real difference ? For the most part, one seat's distance is the furthest remove required. And is this so great a matter ? One might suppose that even a young new-married couple, while yet their honey-moon was at the full, might consent to sit some *three feet apart*, and endure this limited absence even for an hour and a half, without being rendered altogether inconsolable by the cruel separation. Nothing, indeed, proves the emptiness of the advocates for pews more glaringly, than the amount of noise they make about this "separation of families." Those who have practised the system find no serious trouble from any of these things, which are such formidable hobgoblins in the imagination of those who are determined *not* to practise it.

Many reasons indeed, might be given for the powerful hold which this particular bugbear has taken on the fancy of some people : but it will suffice to notice the two most powerful. In this country of legal equality, the only chance of securing a "position" in society, is by the union of public display with social exclusiveness. A pew in an eligible part of a Church gives a certain position of respectability among respectable people, especially if it is handsomely upholstered and furnished with richly-bound books. And the legal right to *keep other people out of it*, is absolutely indispensable to the full enjoyment of those who have paid for the right to be in it. The other—and perhaps stronger—motive, is, the instinctive rebellion of "respectable" fallen human nature against that great truth which proves the power of the Incarnation,—that "there is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither bond nor free, there is neither male nor female," but we "are all one in Christ Jesus." Respectable baptized sinners, in broadcloths and silks, do not like to feel as if they were "all one," in any sense, with other baptized sinners in homespun and calico : and therefore they prefer to keep the less respectable sinners on the other side of a stout plank, in a pew by themselves, or on a hard bench in the alley, or somewhere far behind them down by the door. These two are the main roots out of which this great tree of difficul-

ty grows. The less said about the "separation of families," therefore, the more certainly will that objection receive *all the attention it deserves*.

The argument based upon the *quid pro quo* is now all that remains. And we freely own that there is something in it. But that something utterly destroys the new claim so loudly set up, that pew-rent is to be reckoned as an alms, and as having quite as much of the nature of an "offering" and of "sacrifice" as if it had actually been laid upon the altar of pure free-will. We, however, must be permitted to insist upon it, that *quid* is *quid*. The man who rents or buys his seat, pays for something, and gets something for his money. It will not do to say, "He only gets the occupancy of a seat; and *that* he would have at any rate on the Free Church plan: so where's the difference?" This will not do, we say: for we are now considering that argument in favor of pews, which urges that "men are more willing to pay towards the support of the Church when they *get something* for their money." They therefore *get* something: and it will not do to avoid our reply by turning round in the same breath and protesting that they *get nothing* after all. Will they confess that the pew-system squeezes money out of people on false pretences?—that it swindles? No. That will not do. They *get something*. And the fact of their *getting something* is just the difference between an alms and a *bargain*. If a poor man comes to Mr. John Smith for help, Mr. John Smith may have the kindness to make him a present of twenty dollars. But suppose that, not being minded to so large generosity, he says to the poor man, "I can't afford to *give* you the money; but if you have a mind to part with that cow of yours, I'll let you have twenty-five dollars;" and the poor man consents: who would say that John Smith had *made him a present* of the twenty-five dollars? Since he *got something for his money*, it was not a present, but a *bargain*—a good bargain or a bad bargain, according to the worth of the cow: but in either case a bargain—and nothing more than a bargain.

Nor will it do to say that "the *occupancy of the seat* is the *same in either case*." We have a right to walk in a public park, and sit on a bench under the trees all day long if we like, and nothing to pay for the privilege, because it is a Free Park—public property. But suppose that we take such a fancy to one particular part of the park, that we wish to have it for our own, and be able to keep other people out of it, what then? If we can succeed in being allowed to purchase, will it not cost us a pretty penny? And even if, after we get it, we do not build on it, but only sit on the bench and enjoy the shade as

we did before; can it be asked with any common sense, "Where's the difference?" We have *bought and paid for the right to keep other people out*, who before that purchase, had *as good a right there as we*. This exclusiveness is of the essence of all property. A man's house would not be his own house if other people had as good a right to use it as he had himself. It is his own, because he can *keep all others out of it*. His field is his own field, not so much because he can do in it what he will, as because no other man can set foot in it against his will, without committing a trespass. No area can be common property and private property at the same time. The essence of common property consists in the fact that no one man has any more right there than another, and none can therefore exclude another. The essence of private property is, that some one man has *more* right there than anybody else, and can *exclude* all others if he pleases. It is this exclusiveness, and this only, which makes a *pew of their own* so sweet a morsel under the tongue of those who "always like to *get something for their money*."

And yet we are gravely told that this price, thus willingly paid for the right to keep other people out of a pew, and which would not be willingly paid under any other consideration, is to be reckoned as an "offering of a pure heart" unto God; and the treasurer of the parish—so it is hinted—after collecting the pew rents, may keep them in his pocket until Sunday morning comes, and then place them in the alms basin, and have the prayer for the Church Militant said over them on the altar! If the Pew-rent is *alms*, what is to be said of the cost of the pew-carpet and cushions, and morocco-bound books with gilt clasps, and all other furniture of the pew? These sums, we suppose, on the private cash-book, will be charged to the "*Charity account*,"—that sort of *Charity*, which begins at home, and ends there, without ever being seen or heard of elsewhere. It would need but a slight extension of the same principle to include the cost of all the Sunday dresses of the family. Why not? They are for "Sunday" use, and to be worn "to Church;" surely they might just as well be reckoned on the "*Charity account*," also. And thus a skillful accountant may cypher up no very inconsiderable amount of charity in the course of a year,—a mode which none, however, are likely to adopt except those whose annual "*total*" on the charity account would otherwise be but a cypher. This new mode of calculating "*charity*" would be, indeed, valuable, if by thus making it stretch more suprisingly than caoutchouc, it could only be induced thereby to cover the greater multitude of sins. We cannot help, in this connection,

inquiring, whether a charity of this generously expansive sort would not suit those, upon whose "religious sensibilities" the "chink of the money" given at the offertory "falls as disagreeably as the tap of the auctioneer's hammer." It is a very characteristic symptom of the deep perversion which taints the whole system, that under its debasing and debilitating influence, that very act which God has ordained whereby to sanctify to us the possession of property, should actually come to be regarded as a *desecration* of the pure spirituality of His worship! Surely, such "sensibilities" have been refined to the most penurious point of delicacy; and we should not wonder, some fine day, to hear that religion of so exquisitely attenuated a texture "had died of a rose in aromatic pain."

But the worst feature of this popular plan of supporting the Gospel is, that it furnishes selfish men with a very plausible "dodge" for shirking a duty which is proclaimed in Scripture, and reëchoed constantly by the Church, in tones as loud, and terms as plain, as language can make them. Men are required to *give unto God according to the ability that God hath given THEM*. The *ability of the giver* is the standard of God's word, and, therefore, the standard of Free Churches. The Pew-system takes as *its* standard, not a man's ability; but the nearness of his pew to the chancel or the door, as the case may be; or, whether it be in the middle alley, or a side alley, or behind a pillar, or in the gallery. Is *this* the standard for "charity"?—for "alms"?—for "an offering unto God of a sweet savour"? We trow not! This standard has about as much to do with "charity," as the standard by which a seat in the parquette of a theatre may be had at one price; a place in the boxes at another; and a ticket to the amphitheatre at less than either. Yet this miserable "standard," which regulates all that is done on the Pew-system for the support of the Church, wretched and mean as it is, acts like an opiate on the conscience, and blinds it to all further seeing of that standard which is divine. It covers a man up from the power of Holy Scripture, and of Scriptural preaching, as a water-proof cloak covers him up from the rain. Sitting comfortably in his cushioned pew (for which the rent has been duly paid and charged to "charity account,") the solemn reiterations of the Offertory glide by him unheard, or enter in at the one ear and go out at the other; or at most, whenever they rub roughly on some spot yet left sensitive in the deadening soul, they stimulate him only to drop a dollar bill—or even a five-dollar bill—into the plate at some casual collection, instead of the usual twenty-five cents. Whereupon the poor man goes home with as much of a glow

in his bosom as if he had been *liberal* that day. And yet, poorly as they are, for the most part, responded to, the Church is deeply indebted to these extra-parochial collections, and private appeals for aid; for they breathe a little Free-church life and love into a system that has none of its own. Without this portion of our ordinary operations shining before men, there would be, in the working of the Pew-system, only light enough to make "darkness visible."

The standard of the *world* being thus set up in the Church itself, to the exclusion of the standard unfolded in *the Word of God*, the question naturally arises, "How can the Pew-system be so efficient for "the support of the Church?" This is its one great boast,—that it "supports the Church;" and that it is "the only plan on which the Church can be supported." If this claim be true, then the Church ought to be better supported in this country than in any other; because in this country the Pew-system is more generally adopted than in any other. Let us look at *facts* once more.

The Church in Jerusalem had all things common,—but the abundance of this support did not come from pew rents. St. Laurence, at Rome, fed 1500 widows and poor from the treasures of the Church, but there were no pews rented in those days in St. Peter's. From thenceforward, in many lands, the clergy have been many times more numerous than with us; have often been rolling in wealth, living in palaces, vested in silks and velvets, purple and fine linen, and rich in silver and gold and precious stones; Bishops have been barons and princes, and received the revenues of principalities: but all this while no man had yet invented pews. In England, pews have seldom brought in any revenue, except in Proprietary Chapels and among some of the Dissenters; while the wealth of the Church—such as it is—comes partly from tithes, and partly from landed endowments—the present remnant of the real estate given by the piety of individuals in former generations, and of the *whole* of which the Church has *not yet* been plundered by the State. But surely *this* country must make a better showing. This country, where the Pew-system is more general than it has ever been in any other, must certainly "support the Church" better than was ever done elsewhere. You really think so? Then open your ears, and hear *the whole land reëchoing, from one end to the other, with doleful complaints as to the starvation point of support* which is the *general result* of the generally adopted PEW-SYSTEM? Let these two notorious facts—the general pew-system, and the general *starvation* "support of the clergy"—stand up

cheek-by-jowl together,—where they belong. Let any man deny either the one or the other of them,—if he dare. Let him prove that the one does not *account* for the other,—if he can.

The testimony of History as to the *facts* of the two systems, is now, we trust, sufficiently clear. To measure their full significance, however, we must go below the facts, to ascertain the *great and leading principles* which are embodied in them. In no other way can we fairly and fully bring the two systems up, broadside against broadside, to try their metal with one another.

In the history of the Creation of the world, when we read of the making of Man, male and female, there is immediately added the first great law of humanity as given to the first Adam: "Be fruitful, and multiply, and replenish the earth." And when the second Adam came to redeem that humanity which had fallen under the first, the great law of the new creation was the perfect parallel to that of the old. The Church which is Christ's Body, was by Him commanded to "Go and teach *all nations*,"—"Go ye into *all the world* and preach the Gospel to *every creature*." The Ministry were sent forth to be catchers of men; not to organize a system which would keep the greater part of them from all chance of being caught. St. Paul, in the true spirit of a Fisherman, was all things to all men, that by all means he might gain some. Christ died for *all* men, and it was the business of the Church to bring this saving Gospel home to *all* men. Therefore, "*Come ye*," is the universal invitation. The volume of Holy Writ closes its tremendous appeals to men with this its latest voice,—one which was intended to reëcho without ceasing until the dawning of the Day of Judgment:—"The Spirit and the Bride say, *Come*. And let him that heareth say, *Come*. And let him that is athirst, *Come*. And whosoever will, let him take the water of life *freely*." And with such invitations thus given, it is no wonder that the Lord *added* to the Church *daily* such as should be saved;—no wonder that nations flocked to the Ark of God, as doves to their windows. To increase, to multiply, to grow, to gain, to gather in—this is the chief work the Church is ordained to do. She is the great treasure-house of God's grace, and she must draw all men unto her, that they may receive of Christ and be saved. Growth by the Spirit; growth by the Bride; growth by the Ministry; growth by the voluntary labors of the laity; growth by the spontaneous coming of "*whosoever will*," that he may take the water of life *freely*: this is the one prime, all-controlling, all-

overwhelming instinct, the indispensable and ineradicable *law of life*, to the Church of the living God. This must be obeyed *first*, no matter what else may be postponed or neglected. It is impossible that any *practical* consideration can ever, under any circumstances, be for an instant weighed against it. Whatever clashes with this, therefore, must be done away. Whatever impedes it must be cut asunder. Whatever smothers out the life of it, must itself be destroyed.

The Pew-system, on the contrary, says "Come" to nobody, except to those who have bought or rented pews. The essence of it is not, as we have already shown, in obtaining the right to *use* a seat, for *that* exists equally on the other plan: but its essence is that it gives, for money, the right to *keep other people out* of a seat. The legal right to *exclude*, is the soul of the system. We boldly appeal to the experience of every Rector of a large and "successful" pewed Church, who "has not a single pew that is not rented," whether his attempts to get the poor and needy to come to Church have not been almost wholly paralyzed by the impossibility of getting over the repugnance of these people to "intrude" into "other people's seats." Poor folks will not thrust themselves upon that "courtesy" which, even if it utter no rude word, yet constantly greets them with a *look* that says, as plainly as any tongue could speak: "What business have you here? This is not *your* pew!"

And the strong tendency of the system to promote *staying away*, operates largely even on those who take pews. Every Rector of a pewed Church knows how common it is for heads of families habitually to absent themselves from the worship of the Church. They *pay* for a pew; and then, satisfied that they have done their share for "the support of the Church," they feel as if they had a right to be absent as much as they please. Thus, even when the pews are all "taken"—except the preacher or the occasion be an extraordinary attraction—they are on an average *not half filled*. "There is room," indeed, as truly in our pewed Churches as in the King's Festal Hall at the Marriage Supper, yet the hungry crowds in the streets and lanes of the city, instead of being "compelled to come in," are carefully *kept out*. In vain does the patient and laborious Clergyman say, *Come*. In vain do the Spirit and the Bride say, *Come*. The pew system, like Satan under the tree in Paradise, impudently contradicts the Spirit and the Bride, and, with cold-blooded yet eager mercilessness, reiterates, in hoarse yet energetic whispers of indignant selfishness: "*Stay away! stay away!*"

Hence it follows, as a matter of course, that while the Free

Church plan is a full embodiment of that first great law of the Church's life—*growth*—the pew-system has never been so much as suspected of any such tendency. Not even the most fanciful or the most ingenious of its many advocates, has ever hinted that the pew system was a valuable auxiliary in a *Missionary* enterprise, or an efficient ally in carrying on the Church's *conquests* from the domain of the world, the flesh and the Devil. It is much more powerful in bringing a *flood of worldliness into the Church*, than in converting worldlings to a life of Faith. So long as there is any stomach for vigorous conquest for the Church, free seats carry the day. When conquests are over, when no further growth is looked for, and when a congregation is ready to repose from past toils and payments, and begin respectably and comfortably to *stagnate*: then, as the *Recorder* expresses it, "it seems desirable to change the *free* into a *pewed church*." Certainly; by all means. The pewed Church is incomparably *better to stagnate in*, than the *free*. That process may there be carried on without any fear of serious disturbance: for in that system not a pulse beats, nor a nerve thrills, nor a fibre of its frame can feel, in any true sympathy whatever, with that which is the **FIRST GREAT LAW OF LIFE** in the Church.

There are difficulties, of course, in the working of the Free Church system, as in all others; and they are worthy of a full and patient investigation, which we may hope to give them at some future time. One of these is the difficulty of maintaining a definite pastoral tie, a recognized and tangible connection, between the priest and the people of his flock. Another is the mode by which such Churches shall hold and administer their temporalities, and be represented in Convention. The full tabularization of statistics would also be very valuable, could full statistics only be obtained. But these are matters of subordinate importance, and we cannot dwell upon them now.

To diversify and enliven the discussion of abstract principles and general results, however, let us examine a few details, merely by way of a sample.

The Church of the Advent in Boston is the newest of the large parishes in that city, the only one conducted on the Free system, having no proper Church of its own, worshipping at first in an upper room and now in an ugly old dissenting meeting house, being for the greater part of its parochial existence under Episcopal *taboo*, and with scarce any fraternal "exchanging" with other clergy. The other and older parishes are pewed, have excellent buildings of their own, have been in favor with their Bishop and each other, and have had not a sin-

gle one of the obstacles to contend with, that have embarrassed the progress of the Advent. Yet the latter has run ahead of them all, having now 406 Communicants; and the offertory for the past year has yielded \$9,620.23,—about \$23.70 for each Communicant. Nearly the whole congregation is largely made up of people of moderate means, and *mostly of the poor*.

The Church of the Holy Communion, New York, occupies so prominent a place in the list of Free Churches, that it ought to be mentioned here in order to remove popular misapprehensions, if for no other reason. It has been stated that it is composed mainly of the rich. This is a gross error. Of its 250 Communicants, only a little more than one tenth belong to that class. About four tenths belong to the middle class; and fully one half to the *poor*. The average of the Offertory for several years has been about \$3,000 for parochial purposes, and about \$4,000 for Missions and other Church objects: an average of \$28 for each Communicant. This \$7,000 a year, however, is *exclusive* of all that has been done for St. Luke's Hospital, and for the admirable Institutions and operations more immediately connected with that Church. What all these would amount to, we have not been able to ascertain; but so far as our limited knowledge can trace the truth, the total would be at the least between *three and four times as much*. What the sum really is, God only knows. And when to all this is added the influence this Church has had, in promoting the beauty and the true devotional Spirit of our Services among all classes of Churchmen, and in quickening and multiplying the labors of love now so vigorously pushed onwards in so many quarters: we may well say, that of all the Churches among us, there are few that we could not better afford to lose.

In Grace Church, Albany, Communicants 90; one third of them poor, just able to live; not a single man of wealth in the congregation. Offertory for last year \$1,377.83:—average for each communicant \$15.31. This is a larger proportion than prevails in St. Paul's, (a fashionable pewed Church in the same city,) even *counting in the pew-rents as so much alms*. In Holy Innocents, in the same city, the proportion to each of 110 Communicants is about \$12, the congregation being largely composed of British immigrants of the laboring class. The same is the average in Holy Innocents, New York. In St. Paul's, Newark, \$13. In Christ Church, Vicksburg, \$16.66. In the Church of the Advent, Brownsville, Texas, \$50. *There are no pewed Churches in the land, with congregations of similar character, and under similar circumstances in other respects, which equal, much less surpass, these proportions.*

When a worse system has been so long in use in this country, and when habits of stinginess towards religion have been so deeply ingrained in every rank of society, it takes a long while before the results of a new system can be made to do justice to its inherent strength. But with the beginning already so well made, and such wholesome examples before his eyes, no faithful and laborious man need any longer believe that it is the pews only that keep him above (or *at*) the starvation point. This is a very tolerable degree of success, even as the advocates of pews reckon success,—in *dollars and cents*.

But the great triumph of the free system is in the character and composition of the congregations. We have been called "the Church of the Rich" long enough. The time is rapidly coming,—and Free Churches are nobly hastening it,—when this will sink from the dignity of a reproach against us, into the turpitude of a slander. Free Churches attract all classes, and in *very fair proportions*. They do not skim off the rich cream of the social dish: but high and low, rich and poor, one with another, here pray and praise the Lord side by side. The Church of the Advent, Boston, has worshipers of every kind, in fair proportion,—few of rich, more of moderate means, and most of poor. The proportions in Holy Communion, New York, we have already given. Grace, Albany, as we have mentioned, has no man of wealth; some few professional men; and only 12 or 13 families able even to keep a servant. Holy Innocents, Albany, mainly British laborers. Ascension, Frankfort, sees the Governor of Kentucky often worshipping in the seat next to a laboring man. St. John's, Louisville, Kentucky, Communicants 150, principally from the poorer classes and those in moderate circumstances,—clerks, mechanics, foundry-men and sempstresses. Holy Cross, Troy, Communicants 150, in moderate circumstances, except about twelve individuals who may be called rich. Grace Church, Petersburg, Virginia, Communicants 185, two-thirds of them from the laboring population. St. James, Syracuse, Communicants 100, from all classes, a majority of them persons in very moderate circumstances. Brownsville, Texas, of all classes. Key West, Communicants 98, mostly from the poor, and from the Methodists, though some of the first men of the place belong to the Church also. St. John's, Lancaster, is a remarkable specimen of the energy of the Free Church system. By its means, a congregation of 2 to 300 in the morning, and some 500 in the evening, mainly poor, systematically worship God and hear the Gospel preached unto them, where, on the pew-system it would have been ridiculous to attempt anything. It is all clear conquest.

The Old Church was abundantly sufficient for all the "Episcopalians" in the place. But perhaps, as a classified illustration, the analysis given of the 61 Communicants in the Church of the Holy Innocents, New York, although a young and as yet feeble enterprise, will give as good an example as any, of the way in which the Free Church plan penetrates all the *strata* of society, taking its largest proportions from the lower, which are always the more numerous, classes :—

| | |
|-----------------------------------|----|
| Retired from business, | 6 |
| Merchants, | 5 |
| Lawyers and Physicians, | 6 |
| Retail Traders | 4 |
| Clerks, | 6 |
| Teachers, | 5 |
| Mechanics, | 10 |
| Sewing women, | 7 |
| Laborers, | 12 |
| | — |
| | 61 |

This is giving the Gospel something like *fair play*. And when, with a congregation composed of such materials, the proportion of offerings rises to so high a figure, what would it not do in the great pewed parishes of our large cities, where pew-rents and fashion, silks and satins, feathers and flounces, leave little or no room for the poor ?

We know well that it may be urged in reply to these imperfect statistics, that they are to be accounted for, perhaps, by local peculiarities, or by the character and zeal of individual clergymen. We will therefore take more particularly the working of the two systems in two different places, in each of which the *same clergyman* at different times tried both plans, and with results highly characteristic of each.

Let us begin with St. Paul's, Key West, Florida, under the Rectorship of the Rev. C. C. Adams. There the old Church (blown down) was rented. The new Church, built in 1848, was *free*, and the difference soon began to be felt. The Communicants increased from 15 in 1848 to 98 in 1856 ; the monthly offerings from \$3 or \$4 to \$20 or \$30. The Church was *always out of debt* on the Free plan. The Rector's income of \$900 a year was during all that time paid quarterly with *perfect punctuality*, never once failing to be ready when called for. The poor were attracted, and an impulse was given to the Church, *over all the sects in the place*.

The other case is that of Christ Church, Vicksburg, under the Rev. F. W. Boyd, the late lamented Patterson, and the Rev. Mr. Lord. The latter part of the pew system, and the beginning of the free, were both during Mr. Patterson's Rectorship.

The Parish was organized in 1839 ; Church not built and consecrated till May 3, 1843. Two days after consecration, the pews were sold. The Rev. F. W. Boyd was Rector, for two years, at a salary of \$1,200 a year. He then resigned, his salary being in arrear \$1,050, and \$1,225 being due from pew holders !

The Rev. S. Patterson was called in September, 1845, at a salary of \$1,000 a year ; of which he afterwards voluntarily gave up \$200 : and yet, even at this reduced rate, in less than three years it was in arrear to the amount of \$436. The remedies proposed were, *increase of the rent* on each pew, and a *further reduction* of the Rector's salary ! In May, 1849, the arrears had increased to \$599. In June, after " Resolving " that not more than \$600 a year could be relied on from pew-rents for the salary, they coolly voted that the Rector's salary consist of the pew-rents, whatever they may be ; the arrears of pew-rent going to liquidate the arrears of salary ! There was evidently little comfort in this prospect ; and accordingly, by the end of April, 1850, the arrears of salary had mounted up to \$704.95. At this point, the pew-system—that indispensable means of " supporting the Church "—was *abandoned in despair*. All the pews, (except three, likewise added soon after,) were thereupon declared FREE, and a new era at once began. *The salary has never been in arrears since*. It started, on the Free system, at \$800, and has since steadily risen. The quota assessed for the Bishop's salary is promptly paid in the same way. After Mr. Patterson's death, of yellow fever, in 1853, Mr. Lord was called at \$1,400, besides a life policy costing \$160 a year ; moreover, a parsonage was purchased and put in complete repair, at a cost of some \$3,500 ; all which, with \$200 added to the salary in Easter, 1855, makes his income equal to \$2,000 a year. Nor is this all. Other contributions for Church objects have increased in similar manner. During the past year, they have amounted to \$2,902.61, besides the Rector's salary. During the reign of the pew-system, the grounds of the Church were uninclosed ; hogs, and worse nuisances still, were at home in the basement. The ground is now enclosed, and planted tastefully with trees and flowers, in the midst of which rises the monument of the lamented Patterson, standing under the shadow of those trees which his own hand had planted. The ordinary attendance at Church has nearly doubled, the gain being from the middle and lower classes, and the *young men*, who had been kept away mainly by the bugbear of *pews*. The number of communicants has increased to 120, of whom 117 have been known to commune on one day. An organ, to cost \$1,800, has been ordered and is subscribed for ; and further accommodation for colored people is provided in the gallery. Ev-

ery Church call is answered promptly, cheerfully, easily, and to the full amount, and sometimes more.

These are specimens of the mode in which the Church is "*supported*" by Pew-rents, and "*must certainly go down*" under the system of Free seats. Our advice to doubters may all be summed up in two words—*Try it.*

But this whole question of "*support*"—though satisfactorily disposed of even by what we have said—must rightfully be placed on far higher ground. "*The Church must be supported,*" says one. "How can the Clergy labor and preach the Gospel, if they be not *supported*?" asks another. "The first requisite for success," chimes in a third, "is a *competent support* for the minister." In England, they will not even consecrate a new Church, until there is some endowment secured, for the permanent *support* of the Parson. The odious prominence thus given to the matter of "*support*," is a very characteristic commentary upon the profound scheme of successful finance, which the Church of our day so generally adopts, namely: The selling her birthright of a *Free Gospel*, for that wretched mess of pottage known as the Pew-system. She devours the proceeds, with as little satisfaction as Pharaoh's lean kine experienced on swallowing their fatter fellows; and finds, at length, that one mess of pottage—and such thin pottage too—is not enough to prevent forever after the pangs of returning hunger. "Give! Give!" is the cry of the famishing Clergy, from Dan to Beersheba. The ministers of Christ's Church are almost starving, because this pew-renting Church does not give her *Reverend* "Scholars and Gentlemen" as much to live on as men of the world give to draymen, and third-rate clerks, and French cooks. This state of things is disgraceful. The half-suppressed cry of pinched-up clerical poverty is too sadly reluctant to be feigned; is too real to be longer disregarded. And yet that such a cry should be raised in the midst of, and everywhere throughout, a Church so abounding in wealth as ours, is a burning shame. There must be "something rotten in Denmark." What *is* it? Who can tell us? Let us examine it for a while, patiently and honestly, and we shall find out.

"How shall they hear without a preacher?" saith St. Paul. And that is what we all say. There is a great deficiency in ministerial supply. What remedy is proposed? Every where we hear but one: "Pray ye to the Lord of the harvest." Very good advice, none better. Men therefore pray, or appear to be praying, very earnestly: but they do *nothing more*,—and there is an end. The deficiency is *not remedied*.

We have not yet reached the cure, then. Let us go on to

the next step with St. Paul : perhaps we may learn something of him. *He knew.* He then continues :—"How shall they preach, except they be sent ?" These words are nothing new to us : we have heard them a thousand times before. But stop a moment, and let us think what they really mean. "Except they be *sent* ?" "*sent* ?"—Well, that *does* sound strangely, come to think of it. That is not the way *we* talk now a days. What has the *sending* to do with it ? Of course a man must be ordained before he ought to preach : but will his ordination find him in bread and butter ? Will it pay house rent and coal bills ? Will it support him, and his wife and family ? 'How shall they preach *except they be supported* ? *That's* the way we talk in this nineteenth century ! Yet St. Paul said nothing there about being *supported*. Curious that he should seem to *take it for granted* that they would be supported, is it not ? We never take *that* for granted ! We know better ! St. Paul must have lived in a very enthusiastic age ! It was an age of miracles then !"—and so we shrug our shoulders, and let it pass : when if we would but push the matter a little further, we might chance to light on a grand discovery.

St. Paul evidently could not have forgotten the duty that lies upon Christians to "*support*" their Clergy, as we call it. Any body that has ever heard the Offertory read, knows those unsparing words of St. Paul to the rich and luxurious Corinthsians, "*If we have sown unto you spiritual things, is it a great matter if we shall reap your worldly things ?*" And again, to the same. "*Do ye not know, that they who minister about holy things live of the sacrifice ; and they who wait at the altar are partakers with the altar ? Even so hath the Lord also ordained, that they who preach the Gospel should live of the Gospel.*" And again, to the "foolish Galatians," he says, with a short, sharp, and searching severity, which ought to stir the hearts and consciences of both preachers and hearers to the depths every time they say or hear it,—"*Let him that is taught in the Word minister unto him that teacheth in all good things.* BE NOT DECEIVED, GOD IS NOT MOCKED : FOR WHATSOEVER A MAN SOWETH THAT SHALL HE REAP." This is St. Paul's doctrine about supporting the Clergy : and it is strong enough, in all conscience. But why did he not mention it in the other place first quoted ?

It was simply because St. Paul understood the Gospel so much better than we do. It was because he never conceived of such madness as trying to get men to *bargain how much they would pay* for the Gospel, *before* the preacher was to begin to preach ! It was because he was determined not to let the first impression of such mercenary filthiness blind the eyes

or stop the ears of that city of merchant princes—those revelers in all that was exquisite in art, wealth and refined sensuality,—it was for this reason, that he chose *that very city* as the place where to labor with his own hands at his humble trade of tent-making, so that he might not be chargeable to any of them, but give them the Gospel *FREE, in every sense*. St. Paul knew that *works*, to be truly *good works*, must be works of *faith*. He knew that faith cometh *by hearing*, and not *before they can begin to hear*. He does not therefore tell them to support their preacher, *in order* that he *may* preach unto them. And the preacher is not to wait for a support, *before he shall begin to preach*. But he *must* preach *because he is sent*, not because he is “supported.” And he *must* be *supported*, not in order that he may preach, but *because he does preach*. It is not a bargain on either side: but a *duty on both sides*. Preaching comes *first*. Faith follows as the blessing upon hearing the Word. And then the good work of supporting the ministry comes last of all, as one of the fruits of faith. To put this good work as one that can by any possibility be rightly done *before Faith*, is to reverse the Gospel, and turn it *completely inside out*.

Therefore, in all St. Paul’s strong commands on this subject, he never leaves us in any doubt as to which comes first. A man “planteth a vineyard” *first*, before he “eateth of the fruit thereof.” He “feedeth the flock” *first*, before he “eateth of the milk of the flock.” The Apostle says, truly, “we have sown unto you spiritual things,” *before* he asks, “is it a great matter if we shall reap your worldly things?” Men *first* “minister about holy things,” *before* they have any right to “live of the sacrifice;” they *first* “wait at the altar,” *before* they are “partakers with the altar.” So “preach the Gospel” comes *first*, “live of the Gospel” comes *afterwards*. Men must *first* be “taught in the Word,” *before* they are bound to “minister unto him that teacheth in all good things.” And then comes the stern, clear-ringing warning against precisely what the pew-system has done—the Apostle straitly charges us, “Be not deceived, God is not mocked; for whatsoever a man soweth, that shall he reap.” He must sow *first*, and reap *afterwards*. To reverse this heavenly order, as the pew-system does throughout, is to *deceive ourselves*, and to *mock God*. We deceive ourselves when we trust to that pew-system which paralyzes us, as the main reliance for the “support” of the Church. And we mock God, when his Church, though rolling in wealth, leaves his priests to starve.

But priests may learn, as well as people, from these sharp, soul-cleaving words, “*Whatsoever a man soweth, that shall he*

reap." The Clergy have sown cowardice, and reap starvation. So long as they speak with weak lips and with a stammering tongue upon the *duty of giving*, and giving with that abundance which is required by the *law of love*: so long will their poverty pinch their cheeks, and leanness scarce cover their bones. So long as they "fear to offend the laity" by preaching what they ought, so long the laity will *not* fear to offend both God and them, by doing what they ought *not*. If the clergy, therefore, reap emptiness, let them look to it, whether they have not sowed *chaff*, instead of wheat.

The Church, with instinctive fidelity, follows closely after Holy Scripture. She does not pretend to any ability to improve upon St. Paul. Preaching first, practising afterwards. The true old-fashioned mode of pewed churches, is to make the collection *before the sermon*, lest something in the sermon might perchance move the conscience to be more liberal than "Mr. Worldly-Wisdom" has determined on beforehand. The Church, however, orders the offertory *after* the sermon, not before; and *immediately* after, in order that the preaching of the Word may be *immediately* embodied in works of faith. She does not believe that there is any virtue worth relying on in works done "*before the grace of Christ, and the inspiration of his Spirit.*" She says of them,—in words so admirably descriptive of the beauties of the pew-system, that we cannot resist the temptation to quote them in full—she says (Article XIII) that they—

"Are not pleasant to God, forasmuch as they spring not of faith in Jesus Christ; neither do they make men meet to receive grace, . . . yea, rather, for that they are *not done as God hath willed and commanded them to be done*, we doubt not but they have the nature of sin."

Thus, then, the two systems stand compared. On the one side, the first thing sought is the *preaching* of the Gospel; on the other, the first and foremost object is the *pay*. On the one plan, the duty of supporting the Church follows as a *consequence* of preaching: on the other, the preaching follows as an enjoyment *consequent* upon supporting the Church; in strict accordance with that popular axiom which embodies the whole philosophy of the pew-system in its proper relative order: "*No pay, no preaching.*" On the one hand, the *motive* for paying to "support the Church," is love to God and love to man: on the other, the only motives are selfish—selfish for one's own exclusive comfort, or for that of family, or for the respectability of social position. On the one hand, the *standard* of the

amount to be given, is God's own standard,—*the ability of each man*, according as God hath given him : on the other, the standard is the voice of *the world*,—how much other people give for similar pews ; or, how much *that* pew will fetch at auction.

In *History*, the one is of Pentecostal birth, and from thenceforward the invariable path to all the real conquests the Church has ever gained in any age, even in this our own land, and in these our own days. The other is of Puritanic birth, stealing surreptitiously and illegally into the Church, and thenceforward invariably blighting her growth, stifling the breath of her freedom, stiffening the pliant energy of her members, starving her Clergy, and so choking up the River of Life—of which she is the appointed channel—that its irrepressible waters are forced over their lawful banks, and run to waste in strange pastures, whose irregular fertility shames the barrenness of the very “Garden of the Lord.” Even in the mildest form of the evil, we find that all its real ornaments are jewels stolen from the very system it would fain destroy ; while, at the moment of its loudest boasts about its success in “supporting” the clergy, there is a more universal and more undeniable outcry against the “starvation-point” of that “support,” than ever any part of the Christian Church has been compelled to raise before.

In *Argument*, we have seen that the advantages of a “certain income,” and “keeping families together,” and “getting something for one's money,” are no sufficient justifications of the Pew-system. Even granting that the assertion as to income were true, will they ask us to weigh the *souls of men* who are now *kept out*, against a few more *dollars* to be *gotten in* ? And shall men's souls be made to kick the beam, as of less weight in the scales of the Church, than Mammon ? That some respectable families may say their prayers more comfortably, is no sufficient reason for excluding hundreds and thousands of other families from any chance to worship at all. Nor is it any comfort to think that a few well-to-do men “get the worth of their money ;” when thereby the masses of the poor outside, are kept from getting even so much as a *hearing* of that Gospel which may open to them the gates of Paradise.

In *Essential Principle*, we have found that the one system follows the order of St. Paul : the other reverses it. The one puts Faith before Works : the other, Works before Faith. The one publishes the Gospel in the order in which Christ and His Apostles delivered it : the other turns it wrong side out. “*Free Grace*” is the motto over the doors of the one : “*Grace sold*”

here," over the doors of the other. The one, with the Spirit and the Bride, says, *Come*: the other with the Flesh and the Devil, says "*Stay away!*" The quickening principle with one is the love of God: with the other, the love of *money*. The instinct of the one is life and growth: of the other, stagnation and death. The one plants the mustard seed of Faith, and waters and trains it up to a goodly tree with great boughs, and leaves and fruit: the other takes the well-grown tree, turns it upside down, buries its leafy boughs deep in the earth, leaves its naked roots to harden in the dry air; and then wonders why it does not grow!

In *Practical Results*, we find that the one *preaches the Gospel to the poor*, as fully as can be desired: while the other has clothed us, in popular estimation, with the wretched reproach that we are "*the Church of the rich*,"—a reproach which is, in God's sight, as loathsome a covering as the shining white scab of the leprosy. And it appears, also, that even in income, the free system is the better of the two: and that, as in other cases of compact with the Devil, men's *souls* are *sure* to be *lost*; while the Arch-fiend, at the same moment, cheats his dupes out of the very price which tempted them to ruin. The Devil's gold-pieces turn to slate-stones: the clergy who cling to the Pew-system for a "support," cry aloud from hunger. And no wonder! How should it be otherwise, when in the very House of God, Mammon sits aloft upon the throne of *Love*; *Exclusion* is the law of the Temple built for *Communion*; and the sound of the voices of St. Paul and St. James,—nay of the Lord Christ Himself,—is drowned by the soulless, galloping gabble of the auctioneer. There is but one more step to be taken in this direction. Tear down the glorious standard, bearing the monogram of Christ and His cross, which of old gave the Empire of the Roman world to a follower of the Lamb, and which has ever since led Christendom to victory. Tear it down, we say. Run out, in its place, the *little red flag*. And inscribe upon *that*, if you dare, the trumpet-toned watchword of Christian warfare,—Εὐ ΤΟΥΤΩ *vixit*.—*Conquer, in THIS!*

The two systems, then, stand opposed to one another, somewhat mixed and mingled in practice, indeed; but the one, in essence, a service of God: and the other, of Mammon. Like Gerizim and Ebal, the mountains of the Blessing and the Curse, so these two gigantic foes stand up face to face, in deadly earnest, giving the lie to one another. On the broad and generous shoulders of the one, rests a robe of the richest perennial verdure, ever watered by the dew of Hermon which falleth upon the Hill of Zion. On the bald and peeled scalp of the other, blight and barrenness are spread out, like the

dreary drought and desolations of Gilboa, where the Lord departed even from His own Anointed, and left him whose love passed the love of women, to fall beneath the sword of the uncircumcised.

It is high time, moreover, for the Church of America to take her choice between them. "How long halt ye between two opinions?"—might as startlingly be asked of us now, as of ancient Israel on the slopes of Carmel. All round us are multiplying rapidly the signs, that it is to the "little Flock" the Lord God is making ready to give the Kingdom. All round us the old and numerous foes of the Church are preparing to make themselves an easy prey, when the Day of the Lord shall come. Rome has at length repudiated her lying claim to antiquity, thrown off the mask of impudent deceit, and *now* dates her creed, not from Christ, and St. Peter and St. Paul, but from the decree of Pope Pius IX, on the 8th of December, 1854. In this land, Romanists are largely deprived of their aggressive power, being compelled to dilute their Popery so extensively with Protestantism, that its best friends in *Italy* would hardly know it. They are weakened, also, by the political suspicion under which they labor, being the only body of Christians which invariably mixes itself up with politics: while our rapidly growing *prestige* among the wiser men of all parties, is solely due to the fact that we confine ourselves wholly to religion, and *let politics alone*. Therefore it is that the threefold cord of the Church is, even now, the strongest band that binds this Union together. And finally, the innumerable desertions from the ranks of Romish immigrants are a fearful foretaste to them of the falling away in their numbers, by the time another generation shall have still further transformed their ignorant masses by the education and the atmosphere of freedom. And the tens of thousands thus falling away—who shall gather them in?

On the other hand, there is not a sect in the land, no matter how bitter, in time past, against the Church, which does not now feel more and more of her influence, and is not now secretly—nay openly—yearning after those very things which have been so long hated and despised. "Sectarianism" and the "Sectarian spirit" are a stench in the nostrils of all the sects, without exception. Their own people loathe that meat which is all that their pastors have to break to them as the Bread of Life. The usages which of old they most abhorred, they now resume, with more eagerness of enjoyment, indeed, than is often found among us. Sick of extemporary prayers, they are groping and feeling their way towards a Liturgy.

They sing once more the Psalter to antiphonal chaunts. They stretch forth and grasp each other's hands, striving to create among themselves that Unity which they have not, and for the want of which they know their souls to be faint and dying. On every side the disintegration of old organized enmities is going on. It seems almost as if the Church had been doing as was done of old at Jericho ;—as if the priests of the Lord had already compassed the city seven times, and that at the blowing of their silver trumpets the buttresses of thick prejudices had crumbled away, and the massive walls of separation had fallen down flat, so that all now needed from the Israel of God was only to ascend up every man straight before him, and take the city. The whole is gradually yet rapidly opening up for easy conquest. And therefore no longer defense, or apology, but *conquest* should henceforth be the chief instinct of her life. Let her grow, and gain, and ride on, conquering, and to conquer.

But to do this she must first herself be fully FREE. The feet of them that bring good tidings of good, how shall they be beautiful upon the mountains, how shall they go on, publishing salvation, so long as they are thus heavily laden with the fetters of a system that makes the Church a prisoner at home, in her own house ? The hands that are stretched forth to deliver,—to bestow unto others that blessed liberty with which Christ hath made us free ;—how shall they win the wicked world to receive the gift, so long as every motion rattles the manacles that yet encumber her arms ;—manacles of heaviest lead, ever bearing those hands down to earth, when they should be spread up to heaven ;—manacles of lead, yet thinly and shabbily gilded on the outside, to cheat fools into the belief that they are ornaments of gold, instead of the shackles of slavery ? How shall the priests' trumpets be heard throughout all Jericho, if they take so great pains to muffle up their soul-piercing sound, that it shall never be heard outside the canvas walls of the little tents of Israel ? No. Bring the trumpets out into the free air, that their notes may be borne on the wings of all the winds of heaven, and unto all everywhere that have ears to hear. Let the heart of the Church expand and grow great with her glorious work, so that her swelling bosom shall snap asunder these new cords with which she is bound. Let her burst the fetters from her feet, and break in pieces the gilded, mocking manacles from off her hands : and then may she be once more seen, beautiful upon the mountains, publishing peace. Then, and not till then, may she spread forth her loving arms, in triumph, to embrace a New World.

All the people are gathered together, weary of the cruel vanities of Baal. The day is far spent. The time of the offering of the Evening Sacrifice draweth nigh. The Altar of the LORD, that was broken down, is repaired. The sacrifice lies upon the Apostolic number of unmovable stones, ready for the sacred flame. Again, and again, and again, have our prophets drenched it through and through with cold water. Would God that Elijah were only here to call down *the Fire!* And is he not promised unto us once more "before the coming of the great and dreadful Day of the Lord?" And is not that Day now nigh at hand? Aye! *Once more* shall there fall Fire from Heaven! And *once more* shall ALL THE PEOPLE fall upon their faces, and say, "The Lord, He is the God; the LORD, He is the God!"

ART. VII.—BOOK NOTICES.

THE RISE OF THE DUTCH REPUBLIC. A HISTORY. By JOHN LOTHROP MOTLEY. In three volumes. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1856. 8vo. pp. 579, 582, 664. New Haven: T. H. Pease.

We have examined these volumes of Mr. Motley with surprise and pleasure. Surprise, that an author hitherto unknown to fame should at once come forward to occupy a place in the very front ranks of our men of genius and learning—pleasure, in this new illustration of the intellectual treasures which are contributing to enrich our national literature. We know full well the popular impression in England as to the influence of our social institutions on high mental culture; and yet, notwithstanding the deluge of mere trash poured perpetually from our press in every department of literature, there is no inconsiderable number of men in our country who have both genius and learning to give to the proudest annals of our nation, and to her triumphs in the material world, befitting expression; in a word, to win for our nation as high a reputation in the nobler fields of Science and the fine Arts as she has gained in those of industrial prosperity. In this select list we may place Mr. Motley, the author of these three portly volumes. He has chosen a field comparatively new, and yet a theme fully worthy of his talents. We are in danger of forgetting the lofty position which the Dutch, as a nation, once occupied; for in the *renaissance* which characterized the sixteenth century, in the sundering of the chains of feudalism, in the emancipation from papal bondage of the national intellect and heart, in the sudden expansion and growth of national enterprise, in the extent and value of her colonial possessions, and the magnitude of her commercial relations, the Dutch Republic stood at that day unrivaled among all the nations of the earth. In all Eastern and Southern Asia, South Africa, and Australia, what are the British doing now, but reaping where the Dutch have sowed? and over all our own continent, in South America, the West Indies, and the United States, we find still the abiding fruits of that same element of national enterprise and power.

We were led to anticipate much from this work, from the high compliment paid to it in advance by our distinguished historian, Mr. Prescott. The author has spent several years in the country whose annals he here narrates, and has faithfully studied everything bearing upon his subject, both the contemporary chroniclers and later historians. The Royal Archives of the Hague, of Brussels, and of Dresden, numerous public libraries, and the manuscripts of the Venetian envoys, &c., &c., have been thrown open to his inspection. He seems to have lacked no facility for learning the secret history of the subtle policy of that crafty Republic, of whose selfish cunning Japan is at this day a striking example.

The period which his history embraces is brief, being from the abdication of Charles V, in 1555, to the death of William the Silent, Prince of Orange, in 1584. After a rapid sketch, geographical, ethnographical, political, and religious, of the Netherlands, from the earliest period, in which the elements of the national life and character and their development, are traced for sixteen centuries, down to the imposing abdication of Charles V, he then brings before us the new drama, when the nation, under the promptings of a new and mighty principle, rose in rebellion against the tyranny of Philip II, and after a long, complicated, and bloody struggle, secured for itself complete emancipation from Spanish bondage. The leading characters upon the stage are well presented. It is in this kind of portrait painting, where the current of history is

for the time being personified, a style of writing in which Macaulay so greatly excels, that Mr. Motley makes his best appearance. Philip II, the husband of Mary Tudor—William of Orange, known as the "Silent,"—Granville, the accomplished, crafty Cardinal—Lamoral, Count of Egmont—Francis, Duke of Alençon and Anjou, a prince "ferocious without courage, ambitious without talent, and bigoted without opinions,"—these are among the cleverest sketches in the volumes. Of course much of the ground covered by our author is occupied also by another of our distinguished historians, whose recent work is examined in our previous pages. Yet Mr. Motley's labors are far enough from being superfluous. He has pursued as his one engrossing theme what with Mr. Prescott was only an incident, though a most important one.

In forming our estimate of the national character of the Dutch, we cannot forget that it had in it an element of weakness. It was too exclusively sordid and mercenary, and so became selfish and almost unscrupulous. It was no mere destiny that paled the star of Holland: but the fearful avengings of that stern law which, however unrecognized, still rules among the nations. France soon acquired temporary mastery over Holland herself; and in the East her *prestige* has been steadily yielding before the power of England. Still the Dutch government retains many of her most valuable India possessions, though, alas, unlike the English, it is only to brutalize heathenism instead of Christianizing it. The greater part of the revenue of the Dutch government, in Borneo, for example, is derived from the traffic in opium. It is in respect to this higher province of the Christian philosopher, that the history before us lacks distinctness and boldness. Indeed, the author's power as a writer is in vivid and vigorous narrative, in felicitous grouping of his heroes, rather than in lofty generalization. A leading idea which pervades the work, to wit, that the conception of liberty in the heart of a people, is in itself an element of national power—contains, when broadly stated, a dangerous fallacy. It is such an element of power only when conditioned and guided by a national conscience, a conscience vitalized and directed by God's revealed will. We think, also, that the author's *beau idéal* of national greatness and glory lacks too much the higher moral elements, and rests too exclusively in the intellectual and the material. Mr. Motley is a sturdy republican and a hearty Protestant. His style is lively and picturesque—more ornamental and yet less chaste, and pure, and free from foreign idioms than that of Mr. Prescott. But the work is an honor, and an important accession, to our national literature. A General Index adds to its value as a work of reference. The work will repay more attention than we are able here to give it, and we hope to return to it again, and to examine more particularly the accuracy of one or two points in the historical narrative.

RECOLLECTIONS OF THE TABLE-TALK OF SAMUEL ROGERS, to which is added Personiana. Edited by the Rev. ALEX. DYCE. New York: D. Appleton & Co. 1856. 12mo. pp. 342. New Haven: T. H. Pease.

Samuel Rogers, the poet, died Dec. 18th, 1855, at his house in St. James' place, London, in the presence of Dr. Beattie and Mr. E. Paine, his attendant. Mr. Rogers was born about the year 1760, and had therefore attained the venerable age of ninety five. In 1787, after completing a course of travel, he published his "Ode to Superstition," and other poems; and five years later appeared his "Pleasures of Memory," by which his fame as a poet was established. In 1798 he published his "Epistle to a Friend," and other poems; in 1814, his "Vision of Columbus and Jacqueline;" in 1819, "Human Life;" in 1822, the first part of his "Italy," on the illustration and printing of which he is said to have spent £10,000. Mr. Rogers' house, in St. James' place, was a perfect treasury of art. The pictures are amongst the very best of their class, and though few in number, are said to have cost £6,000.

When Rogers made his appearance as a poet, Lord Byron was unborn—and Byron has been dead thirty-one years! When Percy Bysshe Shelly was born, Rogers was in his thirtieth year—and Shelly has been dead nearly thirty-four years! When Keats was born, "The Pleasures of Memory" was looked upon as a standard poem—and Keats has been dead thirty-five years! When this century commenced, the man who died but yesterday, and in the latter half too of the century, had already numbered as many years as Burns and Byron had numbered when they died.

Mr. Rogers was born before the following English poets: Scott, Southey, Wordsworth, Coleridge, Byron, Moore, Campbell, Bloomfield, Cunningham, Hogg, James Montgomery, Shelley, Keats, Wilson, Tom Hood, Kirk White, Lamb, Joanna Baillie, Felicia Hemans, L. E. L., and he outlived them all. The oldest living poets are, Walter Savage Landor, born 1755; Leigh Hunt, born 1784; and Barry Cornwall, born 1790.

Mr. Rogers was famous for his conversational powers, for his short smart stories, and his sarcastic criticisms; and the Rev. Alexander Dyce has given us the above volume of such gatherings from the breakfast-cloth and dinner-table at St. James' place. Mr. Dyce was a never-failing guest at the Tuesday breakfasts, and had to endure, in common with others, incessant repetitions of the same stories from his host. He does not, however, tell the same story twice in print; and his wallet of queer and pithy stories is well stored.

As a poet, Rogers wrote very little. It was a favorite saying of Sydney Smith: "When Rogers produces a couplet he goes to bed, and the knocker is tied, and straw is laid down, and the caudle is made, and the answer to inquiries is, that Mr. Rogers is as well as can be expected."

One of the severest things Lord Byron ever wrote was a satire on Rogers. It begins thus:

Nose and chin would shame a knocker,
Wrinkles that would puzzle Cocker;
Mouth which marks the envious scorner,
With a scorpion in each corner,
Turning its quick tail to sting you
In the place that most may wring you;
Eyes of lead-like hue, and gummy;
Carcase pick'd out from some mummy;
Bowels (but they were forgotten,
Save the liver, and that's rotten;)
Skin all sallow, flesh all sodden—
Form the Devil would frighten God in.
Is 't a corpse stuck up for show,
Galvanized at times to go?
With the Scripture in connection,
New proof of the resurrection?
Vampyre, ghost, or ghoul, what is it?
I would walk ten miles to miss it.

His remains were interred in the once rural churchyard of Hornsey, not far from Stoke Newington, the place of his birth. Some lines which he loved, "worth all the fine writing (he was wont to say) that the world ever produced," will not unfitly conclude this notice:

A GRAVE BENEATH A TREE.

When my soul flies to the first great Giver,
Friends of the Bard, let my dwelling be
By the green bank of that rippling river,
Under the shade of yon tall beech tree.
Bury me there, ye lovers of song,

When the prayers for the dead are spoken,
 With my hands on my breast,
 Like a child at rest,
 And my lyre in the grave unbroken.

We commend this Boswellian book as amusing in its reminiscences of many of the celebrities of the day.

APPLETON'S CYCLOPEDIA OF BIOGRAPHY; embracing a Series of Original Memoirs of the most Distinguished Persons of all times. Written for this work by Sir Archibald Alison, D. C. L.; William Baird, M. D., F. L. S.; Sir David Brewster, F. R. S.; James Bryce, A. M., F. G. S.; John Hill Burton; Professor Creasy, A. M.; Professor Eadie, D. D., LL. D.; Professor Ferguson, A. M.; Professor Gordon, F. R. S. E.; James Hedderwick; John A. Heraud; Robert Jamieson, D. D.; Charles Knight; James Manson; James McConnechy; Professor Nichol, LL. D.; Elihu Rich; Professor Spalding, M. A.; Professor Thomson, M. D., F. R. S.; Ralph N. Wornum. American edition edited by FRANCIS L. HAWES, D. D., LL. D. With numerous illustrations. New York: D. Appleton & Co. 1856. 8vo. pp. 1,058. New Haven: T. H. Pease.

The basis of this work is the London edition of the "Cyclopedia of Biography," issued during the last year. The peculiarity of the English edition is, that the preparation of notices of different classes of distinguished men was entrusted to persons eminent in corresponding departments of learning. Thus History, Politics, Law, Military Science, Ecclesiastical Affairs, and the Mystics, were given to Alison, Burton, Creasy, Eadie, Ferguson, and the Editor; Classical authors are treated by Ferguson; Theological and Religious, by Eadie and Jamieson; Poets, Novelists, &c., by Spalding; Mathematical and Physical Science are entrusted to Sir David Brewster and Nichol; in the Experimental Sciences, Chemistry to Thomson; Natural History to Baird; and Applied Science to Gordon; Medical Science to McConnechy; Geography to Bryce; Mental Philosophy to Nichol; Theology, Church History, the Fathers, Reformers, and Schoolmen, to Eadie; the Fine Arts to Wornum; and the Drama to Heraud. So far as the English portion of this work is concerned, it has been done thoroughly, and is the most complete Biographical Dictionary for popular use extant. We cannot speak as unqualifiedly of the American portion of the work. Though edited by the Rev. Dr. Hawks, yet no clue is given to the names of the writers of the American articles. Nor are we surprised at this; for they are often, (not always,) hastily written, and extremely imperfect and unsatisfactory. Thus one of the finest American scholars our country has ever produced, was the late Prof. Kingsley. Here is all we are told of him: "Kingsley, James L., an American scholar and classical professor at Yale College, 1778-1852." But where was he born? Where was he educated? In what department of classical learning did he excel? What did he publish? So also to the late Rev. Dr. Jarvis, four meagre lines are given; while on the same page John Jay occupies a column and a half. Other similar illustrations are abundant. We know that the Americans are a "fast" people, and that the fault of which we complain belongs to almost every thing which they undertake to do. In Art, Science, Religion, Philosophy, every thing tends to what is superficial and showy. Perhaps, considering the wealth of learning which has been expended upon this work, even this exception may seem captious and hypercritical. Certainly the Editor and Publishers have given to the public a most invaluable work, and the thousands of names which they have added to the English edition add immensely to its worth. With half a dozen "Biographical Dictionaries" within our reach, great and small, this is more serviceable than the whole of them, and for almost all practical purposes is the only one to which any person need refer.

THE CATHOLIC. Letters addressed by a Jurist to a young kinsman, proposing to join the Church of Rome. By E. H. DERBY. Boston: Jewett & Co. 1856. 12mo. pp. 293.

This is what the English call a really clever book. The author addressed these Letters to a young kinsman who, misled by Milner and other kindred writers, had suddenly conceived the idea that the Church of Rome is the only Primitive, Apostolic and Catholic Church, and was about to be baptized into that communion. The author, Mr. Derby, at once addressed him a series of Letters, drawing his proofs from Holy Scripture, the Early Saints, Fathers, and Popes, as Augustine, Clement, Irenæus, Ambrose, Chrysostom, Eusebius, Jerome, Athanasius, Leo, &c.; showing beyond a doubt that that Church is *not*, and that our own Church *is*, Apostolic, Primitive and Catholic. It being his express aim to destroy the *prestige* of Rome by exposing the hollowness of her pretensions, the author was of course obliged to take the position of an assailant, and hence he is intensely and vigorously protestant; as these old Fathers and writers whom he quotes are, when brought to bear upon the position of modern Rome. As might have been expected, with such an argument presented to an honest and ingenuous mind, the Letters accomplished the end designed by their author, and they are now published at the solicitation of friends. The argument is sufficiently learned, is clear and logical, the language dispassionate and free from invective, and the whole effort is an honor to the head and heart of the writer. He has examined the argument, however, in reference to Order and Discipline, rather than Doctrine, and in this respect his argument is defective. He also speaks of Chevalier Bunsen as an author "of the highest confidence," when he ought to have known that Bunsen has lost caste with the orthodox for his gross heresies. He also shows a want of discernment in using the stale and meaningless phrase, "the Protestant Faith," which is at best the merest nonentity. Still, notwithstanding these and some other marks of a much better lawyer than theologian, his book is a serviceable one. The Appendix contains some valuable papers on the Discipline of the Churches of Antioch and Alexandria, and an admirable digest of evidence respecting the founding of the early British Church by St. Paul. We must give up all faith in man and in truth, or the time will come when such works as this will be felt among the more intelligent and honest of the Romanists themselves.

And yet, highly as we estimate the value of such works, they will not have the slightest influence in deterring a certain class of men from going over to Rome. Moral argument has nothing to do with the question of their apostasy. We do them too much credit when we suppose so.

MEN AND TIMES OF THE REVOLUTION; or, Memoirs of Elkanah Watson: Including Journals of Travels in Europe and America, from 1777 to 1842, with his Correspondence with Public Men, and Reminiscences and Incidents of the Revolution. Edited by his son, WINSLOW C. WATSON. New York: Dana & Co. 1856. 8vo. pp. 460. New Haven: G. B. Bassett & Co.

Elkanah Watson was born in Plymouth, Mass., in 1758, and, having early in life devoted himself to mercantile pursuits, traveled extensively over the country, and became intimately acquainted with the leading public men. In 1779, at the age of twenty one years, he embarked for France, and went into business there, where he enjoyed the friendship of some of the "men of the Revolution," Franklin, John Adams, and others. The author in his Preface says:

"My father, from the age of nineteen to near the close of his life, which was protracted to more than four score years, was in the habit of recording his observations of men and incidents, as the events occurred to which they relate.

"This period embraced the epoch of the War of Independence, and of those amazing mutations which have marked the transformation of dependent colo-

nies into a mighty nation; and of a rude and sequestered wilderness into a territory teeming with beauty, cultivation and affluence.

"In Europe and America he was in the midst of the scenes of this pregnant era, an intimate associate with many of the individuals who impelled or guided these changes, and a vigilant observer of the occurrences connected with their development.

"The journals of my father form a large body of manuscript, which, in connection with a multiplicity of publications on various and most diversified subjects, and a highly extensive correspondence with some of the most eminent men of our annals, comprehend many volumes. These materials constitute the elements of the work I now respectfully submit to the public."

One of the best things in the work is the account of the speech of King George III. in Parliament, recognizing "American Independence." Such works as this have great importance now; they will promote loyalty, rebuke faction, and so cement our national Union. In personal anecdote, historical incident, and geographical information, the book is attractive and valuable.

THE LIVES OF THE BRITISH HISTORIANS. By EUGENE LAWRENCE. 2 vols., 12mo. New York: C. Scribner. 1856. pp. 395, 380.

The extent of this work will be seen in the names of the historians whose "lives" the author has here written; as—the Early Historians Gildas, Bede, &c.—Sir Walter Raleigh—William Camden—Edward Hyde, Earl of Clarendon—Gilbert Burnet, Bishop of Salisbury—Thomas Fuller—Laurence Echard—Robert Brady—John Oldmixon—Thomas Carter—William Robertson—George, Lord Lyttleton—Tobias Smollet—David Hume—Macpherson—Ferguson—Gibbon—Orme—Goldsmith—Fox, &c. More than one half of the first volume is devoted to Sir Walter Raleigh and Bishop Burnet; and more than half of the second to David Hume. This last sketch is to us the best part of the whole work, as it gives a brief yet graphic view of the private life of that distinguished man, analyzing his character, without, however, as thoroughly as we could wish, dissecting his religious principles. The author's praise of Burnet as a historian, is too unqualified and is extravagant; nor has he done full justice to those loyal, much-abused men, who, in those stormy times, saved the Church alike from the machinations of the Puritans and the Papists. The volumes are pleasingly written in a neat and vigorous style, and cover a field which we believe has not before been occupied.

THE SKEPTICAL ERA IN MODERN HISTORY; or the Infidelity of the Eighteenth Century, the Product of Spiritual Despotism. By T. M. POST. New York: C. Scribner. 1856. 12mo. pp. 264.

Mr. Post discusses, incidentally, three of the great questions of the day: first, the causes of Modern Infidelity; second, the primary causes of the Reformation; and third, the relation of Faith and Reason, or of Dogmatic Theology with the human understanding. We do not mean that he makes such a formal division of his subject, but most of what he says will come under one or another of these three heads. It is noticeable how these questions are agitating both the extreme wings of Papists and Ultra-Protestants. Balmes, the Abbe Poisson, M. Capefigue, Montalembert, with Romanists in our own country, are trying to account philosophically for these great movements in modern society, throwing discredit upon the real causes of the Reformation, and undervaluing its results. The elegant Chateaubriand declared that it is "*able to point, amid the ruins it has wrought, simply to some fields it has planted, and some manufactures it has established.*" The same thoughts, in much coarser style, we find echoed by the new Romish recruits in this country. The author before us, on the other hand, takes the opposite view. He finds the causes of modern Infidelity in "the low and relaxed moral tone of the world's mind, at the time the epidemic of unbelief set in—the century and a half of religious agonism and

arms which preceded the revolution in philosophy inaugurated by Bacon and Des Cartes in physics and metaphysics, and by Luther in the realm of religion—and the rise of the idea of wealth to the ascendancy in cabinets of governments, and in general society. Our view is then directed to the "*Fons et origo malorum*," the great CAUSE or CAUSES of the evil we investigate, viz: despotism; despotism both secular and spiritual, but with especial and portentous preëminence of the latter. Our investigation thus brings us to the geographic focus and centre of the plague—France. Its position in European civilization—its civil and ecclesiastical constitution and history—its court, monarchy, church, and literature—these are seen through the malign influence of spiritual despotism, directed to the submersion of belief; and finally resulting in the organization of a conspiracy and crusade against the faith of the world."

There is no doubt that these were among the causes of the Infidelity of the Eighteenth Century; and Mr. Post describes them, though in a somewhat declamatory style, yet with clearness and force. The heart of society revolted from a system of such intolerable despotism, cruelty, and moral corruption. Nor ought we to wonder at the indignant rage of such men as Voltaire and Rousseau, and the French Encyclopædists in holding them up to the hate and scorn of the world.

But these were not *all* the causes of the Infidelity of the Eighteenth Century, nor are they amongst the principal causes of the Infidelity of the present day. And here is where Mr. Post shows his inappetency to grapple with the problem before him. That ultra Protestantism which denies to the Church all authority as the Witness and keeper of the Faith, and which subjects all the Mysteries of Revelation to the test of human reason, has no antidote for modern infidelity. It sees no middle ground between the *Aristotelian* and the *Baconian* methods of seeking for truth in Christianity; or between groundless authority and the freest induction. This is a vital distinction in the controversy; and yet it is one which Mr. Post in his present position cannot grasp. The great question between us as Churchmen with Romanists on the one side and Rationalists on the other turns upon this one simple point. While, therefore, we approve of much which the author says, and appreciate the eloquence and fervor with which he writes, we cannot but regret that we cannot "see eye to eye," as to those deeper truths and principles on which all such problems ultimately must depend for their solution. Perhaps we ought to add that there is occasionally a tone in his discussion which hardly befits the dignity of his subject, and which always betokens the restlessness of conscious weakness. The whole question of the connection of Christianity with civilization and with human progress deserves to be treated with special reference to the present condition of the Universal Church and of Society. But it needs no ordinary pen to do such a subject justice.

THE SPANISH CONQUEST IN AMERICA, and its relation to the History of Slavery and to the Government of Colonies. By ARTHUR HELPS. In two volumes. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1856. 12mo. pp. 490, 470. New Haven: T. H. Pease.

This work purports to have been written with special reference to the elucidation of the establishment of slavery in this country. The author goes back to the great Era of modern discovery—traces the rising interest in that direction—the Portuguese discoveries in Western Africa—the three successive voyages of Columbus,—the results of the discoveries made known, and their influence in the Old World,—the Administration of Columbus and his successors, Bobadilla and Ovando—the voyages of Ojeda, Nicuesa, Enciso, and Vasco Nunez—the abortive attempts at Colonization on the part of the unfortunate Las Casas,—and the splendid conquests of Hernando Cortez. The work is compendious, is written with much animation of style, and is particularly valuable as treating on the forms and modes of social life, which grew up in the settlement of Spanish America.

SICKNESS—ITS TRIALS AND ITS BLESSINGS. First American from the Fifth London Edition. To which is appended *Prayers for the Sick and Dying.* New York: Thomas N. Stanford. 12mo. pp. 490.

No one, unless trained in the severe school of sickness, could have written this work; and no person, unless so qualified, is competent to appreciate it. The trials and temptations incident to this state, with its irritability, impatience, petulance, nervousness, pains, weakness, &c., are unknown to those who have not experienced them; and so, too, are the unworldly blessings, the sweet submission, the quiet contentment, and patience, and submission and cheerfulness, and even the thanksgiving, which are the blessed fruits of such a condition when sanctified. The authoress was encouraged to publish by her Pastor, the Rev. F. C. Massingberd, author of the "History of the English Reformation," and the large sale of the work in England is sufficient endorsement of its worth. It is a really choice book, and many a stricken heart will thank God for it. We need not say that the Clergy will find it an invaluable aid in their pastoral duties.

SKETCHES AND ADVENTURES in Madeira, Portugal and the Andalusians of Spain. By the Author of "Daniel Webster and his Contemporaries." New York: Harper & Brothers. 1856. 12mo. pp. 445. New Haven: T. H. Pease.

That dreamy, listless, voluptuous atmosphere which bathes and permeates everything in Southern Europe, and especially in Andalusia, seems to have had a good deal of influence upon the author of these sketches; and though he writes cleverly and truthfully for aught we know, there is occasionally a sad want of sound moral tone in his descriptions. His chapters upon Gibraltar, Granada, and the Alhambra are, with the exception just noted, very well done. He might have described all that he saw without ministering to a morbid pruriency after what is immodest and indelicate, and in a manner only to be spurned by the pure and virtuous. The deeper problems of Faith, of Civilization, of Morals, and of Society, which Spain now in her decay presents, the present writer does not touch. Why has Spain become such a moral and intellectual Sahara?—is a question he does not once raise. The awful fatality which stifled such men as Sanchez, and Louis de Leon, and Miranda, and blighted the heart of the nation, he does not comprehend. In other words he has the pen of a superficial sketcher of life and manners, but not of a philosopher or a thoughtful moralist and Christian.

HARPER'S CLASSICAL LIBRARY.—

THE TRAGEDIES OF ÆSCHYLUS.—Literally translated. With Critical and Illustrative Notes, and an Introduction. By THEODORE ALOIS BUCKLEY, B. A., of Christ Church, Oxford. To which is added an APPENDIX, (not included in Bohn's volume,) containing the new readings of Hermann's Posthumous Edition. Translated and considered by GEORGE BURGESS, A. M. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1856. 12mo. pp. 394. New Haven: T. H. Pease.

The translation, which is generally after the text of Dindorf, is close and literal, and the numerous notes will greatly aid the student in studying this confessedly difficult author.

A LADY'S SECOND JOURNEY ROUND THE WORLD.—From London to the Cape of Good Hope, Borneo, Java, Sumatra, Celebes, Ceram, The Moluccas, etc., California, Panama, Peru, Ecuador, and the United States. By IDA PFEIFFER, Authoress of "The Lady's Journey," &c. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1856. 12mo. pp. 500. New Haven: T. H. Pease.

This "lady's" first journey round the world, an account of which appeared about four years since, our readers may perhaps recollect. In that book she took occasion to exhibit her aversion to the Missionary work in the East, by

the grossest and most palpable misrepresentations. It seems the locomotive energies of Madame Pfeiffer have again been in vigorous exercise, and on this journey she has exhibited powers of endurance and of fortitude which would be really heroic, if there had been any worthy object to be attained, but which, under the circumstances, appear little less than the most reckless presumption. Why she should face alone the savage cannibals of Sumatra—place herself again and again in the most revolting scenes, where every feeling of delicacy must have been outraged—that is, if she has any delicacy—and all for the mere love of adventure, is to us wholly unaccountable. She thus tells us how she dispersed a formidable company of man-eaters:

"I knew if I could say anything that would amuse them, and perhaps make them laugh, I should have a great advantage over them. . . . I got up, therefore, and patting one of the most violent, who stood next to me, upon the shoulder in a friendly manner, said, with a smiling face, in a jargon half Malay and half Battaker, 'Why, you don't mean to say you would kill and eat a woman, especially such an old one as I am! I must be very hard and tough!' And also I gave them by signs and words to understand that I was not at all afraid of them, and was ready, if they liked, to send back my guide, and go with them alone, if they would only take me as far as the Eier-Tau. Fortunately for me, the doubtless very odd way in which I pronounced their language, and my pantomime, diverted them, and they began to laugh. Perhaps, also, the fearless confidence that I manifested, made a good impression; they offered me their hands, the circle of spearmen opened, and rejoicing not a little at having escaped this danger, I journeyed on, and reached in perfect safety a place called Tugala, where the Rajah received me into his house."

As a book of travels the work is of little value; and the author's religious sympathies or rather want of sympathies, are manifest, though not obtrusively.

THE PIONEERS OF THE WEST; or, *Life in the Woods*. By W. P. STRICKLAND. New York: Carlton & Phillips. 1856. 12mo. pp. 403.

This book contains a series of descriptive sketches upon the following subjects: "The West; Pioneer Explorers of the West; Hunters of the West; Pioneer Settlers; Pioneer Preachers; Pioneer Institutions and Professional Men; Pioneer Boatmen: The Prophet Francis; Logan, the Mingo Chief; The Mountain Hunter; Indian Captivity; The 'Old Chief;' or, the Indian Missionary; The Hermit; Panther Hunting; The Squatter Family; The Lost Hunter; Wisconsin Schoolma'am." The book is written with very moderate ability, and is hardly equal to so attractive a title.

PHYSIOLOGY AND CALISTHENICS.—For Schools and Families. By CATHARINE E. BEECHER. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1856. 12mo. pp. 250. New Haven: T. H. Pease.

Miss Beecher's former work on Physiology we did not like for many reasons. We still doubt the propriety of introducing Physiology as a study into our Public Schools; and on this ground, as well as for an evident leaning to quackery, we would not advise that this portion of the present work be introduced into "schools or families." But her system of Calisthenics is admirable, and has already been adopted in several of the schools of New Haven and New York. There is an imperative necessity of more physical training to promote grace, health, strength and beauty in our Seminaries, and especially in our Schools for girls. To secure that object is one design of this little manual. We have first a detailed system of Physiology with drawings and numerous questions appended to each page; together with the author's views on hygiene, in which she strongly advocates the Water Cure. This is the least valuable part of the author's book, and yet many of her rules and suggestions are sensible and valuable. The best portion of her book is her System of Calisthenic Exer-

cises, with pictures of the various positions, attitudes, exercises, &c. Vigorous out-door exercise and a wholesome nutritious diet would do much to rid us of those puny, sickly, shallow faces which our American girls so often present. The evil, however, is one of the natural fruits of American society; and we suppose snobism will continue to ape gentility by trying to appear extremely delicate, even at the sacrifice of the best physical constitution. The best bred English ladies treat this whole subject much more sensibly. They spend much time in the open air, in riding, walking, gardening, &c., &c., and we need not wonder at the noble, beautiful, healthful countenances which even at an advanced period of life so often greet and surprise the American traveler.

A REVIEW OF THE CYCLOPEDIA OF AMERICAN LITERATURE. By E. H. & G. L. DUYCKINCK. New York: Baker & Godwin. 1856. 8vo. pp. 32.

This scathing review is from the pen of the Rev. Rufus W. Griswold. We regret that we did not see this pamphlet before admitting to our pages the article on the Cyclopædia which appeared in our April No. Besides the numerous and gross inaccuracies which are proved upon the authors of that work, Mr. Griswold charges them with "an utter incapacity to write intelligibly, perspicuously, or even grammatically." This is too sweeping; but the work is a careless and hasty production, and unworthy of its title.

THE TEACHER.—Moral Influences employed in the Instruction and Government of the Young. By JACOB ABBOTT. With Engravings. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1856. 12mo. pp. 353. New Haven: T. H. Pease.

This is a new and revised edition of a thoroughly practical work, by an experienced and successful teacher. The author treats familiarly and illustrates all the details of the school-room, modes of Instruction, Recitation, Government, &c. It would be easy enough to show wherein we differ, and most widely, from the author on the whole subject of moral and religious influences, but his position is too well known to make this necessary. The book is suggestive, and as we see is popular.

LOVELL'S PROGRESSIVE READERS, No. 4.—A series of interesting and instructive Lessons in Prose, Poetry, and Dialogue. With Exercises in Elocution, supplying the means for copious practice on Rhetorical Pause, Inflection and Emphasis. Together with an Explanatory Index. By JOHN E. LOVELL, author of the U. S. Speaker, &c., &c. New Haven: Durrie & Peck. 1856. 12mo. pp. 412.

This series of "Progressive Readers," by that distinguished teacher, Mr. Lovell, is already adopted in a large number of the best schools in the country. Mr. Lovell is one of the best teachers of elocution in the country, and these volumes are the fruit of his long experience and ripe judgment.

THE ANGEL IN THE HOUSE. THE BETROTHAL.—Boston: Ticknor & Fields. 1856. 12mo. pp. 201.

The poet incited by his wife, "who, more than he, desired his fame," pays court to the Sacred Muse, and chose as his theme,

"Your gentle self, my wife,
Yourself, and love that's all in all."
"The song should have no incidents,
They are so dull, and pall, twice read;
Its scope should be the heart's events."

The Poem is fragmentary, abounds in episodes, and the incidents finally terminating in "the Betrothal," are plenteously intermixed with sentimental etchings which the poet calls "The Accompaniments." The mysteries of court-

ship, and the diversified moods of the heart of the fond lover find expression in the poet's verse. The sentiment is better than the poetry, which is often rough and labored; yet there are occasional passages scattered throughout the volume which are not destitute of beauty. Who this new English Bard is, we do not know. But he bids defiance to the Critics, as follows:

"For music's mystic property
Is to make dogs and critics howl.
But we'll not mind this modern curse
Of petty printing wits, who class
The pure gold of a perfect verse
Below like bulk of lacquer'd brass."

If such lines as those beginning,

"Whenever I come where women are,"

Or those,

"I found the Book she had used, and stay'd,"

Or those,

"The train stirr'd; with it, all my worth,"

Or those,

"I know not how to her it may seem,
Or how to a perfect judging eye," &c.,

we say, if such "pure gold of a perfect verse" does not make the "dogs howl," we think the "Critics" can at least afford to withhold their censure.

LEGION; OR FEIGNED EXCUSES—For they are many. By the Author of a "Letter to a Member of a Church Choir." New York: Dana & Company. 1856. 12mo. pp. 114. New Haven: G. B. Bassett & Co.

The popular excuses for the neglect of practical Christian duties with which selfishness in some form or other seeks to cloak itself, are here stripped of their disguise in a very plain, straightforward style. The author will silence where he does not convince and subdue. It is a good book of its kind, and is sure to do a great deal of good.

THE BOY WHO WAS TRAINED UP TO BE A CLERGYMAN. By JOHN N. NORTON, A. M., Rector of Ascension Church, Frankfort, Ky. Philadelphia: H. Hooker. 1856. 18mo. pp. 205. Third Edition.

The secret of the success of this little book of Mr. Norton's, is in the fact that he is an honest man. While he professes to be a Churchman, he is not perpetually on the rack lest somebody should suspect him of being true to his own convictions; and it is also in the fact, that he knows how to reach the popular mind. A plain, intelligible argument, which nobody can fail to appreciate, is more effectual than scores of ponderous tomes which nobody can be persuaded to look at.

LYRA GERMANICA. Hymns for the Sundays and Chief Festivals of the Christian Year. Translated from the German, by CATHARINE WINKWORTH. New York: Thomas N. Stanford, 1856. 12mo. pp. 258.

This volume contains a choice selection of over one hundred hymns from the rich treasures of German song, translated into English by Catharine Winkworth, and arranged after the manner of Keble's *Christian Year*. Many of them are of very ancient date, thus connecting us with and enabling us to participate in those utterances of Christian piety, which have comforted and strengthened the hearts of many true Christians, in ages long since passed by.

"In reading them," says the translator, "it must be remembered that they are hymns, not sacred poems." The length and intricacy of the metres to most of

these hymns, of course would prevent their use with us for any other than that of private devotion, and, at first reading, strike us oddly. Doubtless the tune, to which these lyrics were first sung, aided much to introduce them among the people, and, as it were, nationalize them; for we read in the Preface, in relation to the Hymn, "Leave God to order all thy ways," written by George Neumarch, 1653; "that it spread rapidly among the common people, at first, without the author's name. A baker's boy, in New Brandenburg, used to sing it over his work, and soon the whole town and neighborhood flocked to him to learn this beautiful new song." We select as a specimen of these German Hymns, a part of this one, by Neumarch, arranged for the Thirteenth Sunday after Trinity.

"Leave God to order all thy ways,
And hope in Him whate'er betide,
Thou'lt find Him in the evil days,
Thy all-sufficient strength and guide;
Who trusts in God's unchanging love,
Builds on the rock that nought can move.

"What can these anxious cares avail,
These never-ceasing moans and sighs?
What can it help us to bewail
Each painful moment as it flies?
Our cross and trials do but press
The heavier for our bitterness.

"Only thy restless heart keep still,
And wait in cheerful hope; content
To take whate'er His gracious will,
His all discerning love hath sent.
Doubt not our inmost wants are known
To Him who chose us for His own.

"Sing, pray, and swerve not from His ways,
But do thine own part faithfully,
Trust His rich promises of grace,
So shall they be fulfilled in thee;
God never yet forsook at need
The soul that trusted Him indeed."

The Christmas Carol of Luther, 1540, which he himself styles "a Christmas child's song, concerning the child Jesus," written for his little boy Hans, when the latter was five years old, is very beautiful, as is also that Hymn of Paul Gerhardt, "Cometh sunshine after rain." But we must refer the reader to the book itself for further proof of the beauty of these sacred songs.

The doubtful orthodoxy of Chevalier Bunsen, to whom the book is dedicated, "by his kind permission," would naturally excite some question in regard to the doctrinal soundness of these Hymns, especially when he is thus spoken of by the Literary Churchman of February 9th: "M. Bunsen has at length alarmed the Germans and shown himself in his true colors. The Lutherans and the Reformers are everywhere exclaiming at his statements, that the doctrine of Christ's Divinity is not vital to the Christian scheme, and Justification by Faith a non-essential point."

We have, however, in our brief perusal of the volume, found nothing at all in sympathy with such heretical notions, or with those of any of the school of German Rationalists.

The publisher deserves great credit for the very handsome manner, both as to paper and type, in which the volume is gotten up, and especially for the elegant and appropriate style of binding.

THE PHILOSOPHY OF THE WEATHER, AND A GUIDE TO ITS CHANGES. By T. B. BUTLER. New York: D. Appleton & Co. 1856. 12mo. pp. 414.

The author of this work is one of the Judges of the Superior Court of the State of Connecticut, and was, in the years 1849-50, a Representative in Congress from the same State. His object in writing, as he states, is not the desire to acquire scientific reputation, but to fulfill a promise given to a friend,—to put on record a series of daily and sometimes hourly observations of the clouds and currents of the atmosphere, connected with reports of the then state of the weather elsewhere—to impress the reader with the belief, “that he will derive a pleasure from a daily familiarity with, and intelligent understanding of the ‘countenance of the sky,’ not exceeded by that which any other science can afford.”

With this in view, and divesting his subject, so far of technical terms, as to make it readily intelligible to all, while enough are retained to give clearness and precision to his statements, he has embodied in the volume an amount of useful information, which commends it at once to the student in the closet, the farmer in his field, the traveler on his journey,—to all who are curious about or interested in the weather.

Starting with the assertion, that from the arrangements which exist for the diffusion of heat and distribution of moisture over the earth, with magnetism as the great agent, result all the phenomena which constitute the weather, he discusses at length the manner in which these elements are produced, diffused and distributed—gives the definition and character of storms—the mode in which, and from what ocean “our rivers return”—analyzes the origin and operation of the winds, and the various theories in relation to them, which he deems fallacious, accompanying his criticisms with his own personal observations, and with such diagrams and explanatory plates, as to place the subject clearly and intelligibly before the reader.

The theory of Meteorologists of the present day, who refer all atmospheric conditions and phenomena to the influence of heat, is thoroughly tested and criticised, and that in no *ex cathedra* tone or manner, but in the spirit of his own language, that “the time has come, or should speedily come, when ‘*pride of opinion*’ and ‘*esprit du corps*,’ among theorists and philosophers, should neither be indulged in, nor respected; and when their theories should be freely discussed, and rigidly tested by the observations of practical men.”

The last chapter treats upon “Prognostics” of the weather, in which much curious information, with quotations of quaint sayings and proverbs—many of which we hear in every day life—are blended with “signs which foreshow the weather” and those peculiarities exhibited by animals and birds before approaching storms.

No doubt the theories here advanced will meet with many assailants, and in this the author will not be disappointed, but we opine that the great mass of readers, will peruse this volume with equal profit and pleasure.

THE NEW AGE OF GOLD, OR THE LIFE AND ADVENTURES OF ROBERT DEXTER ROMAIN, WRITTEN BY HIMSELF. Boston: Phillips, Sampson & Co. 1856. 12mo. pp. 408.

This “New Age of Gold,” is a sort of romantic dream, a mere creation of the imagination, though the author labors, (improperly as we think,) to convey the idea that it is a narration of facts, by introducing the names of well known persons, and appending at the end, what purports to be “a note by the publishers,” describing the personal appearance of Mr. and Mrs. Romaine. The book is, however, a “delightful and pleasant one to read and think over.” It seems written to make the reader happy, and will pleasantly wile away the dog days for those who have “nothing else to do.”

SERMONS. By ROBERT A. HALLAM, D. D., Rector of St. James' Church, New London, Connecticut, and author of "Lectures on the Morning Prayer." Philadelphia: Herman Hooker. 1856. pp. 310.

We are glad to see these Sermons by Dr. Hallam. His recent "Lectures on the Morning Prayer," which we are pleased to state, have been received with great favor, and very generally circulated, prepare the way for the perusal of these sermons, with the certainty of receiving rich and instructive lessons. The sermons here collected are mainly of a practical and devotional character—and are admirably suited for family reading, and, with one or two exceptions, for the lay reader also. We fully agree with the Episcopal Recorder, that many of these discourses are "imbued with that sweetness of style and tone which makes the writings of Leighton on the one side, and Manning on the other, so very attractive."

Some of the texts, upon which the discourses are based, may strike the reader oddly and lead him to wonder what lesson can be deduced therefrom, but the manner in which the theme is handled, the sound practical Christian instruction, which is evolved, will convince him that no passage of Holy Writ is without meaning, and that all Scripture is "written for our learning."

The writings of Dr. Hallam are characterized by a certain quaintness of expression, which happily tends to attract and fix the attention, while his terse and piquant style and earnest manner, impress upon the mind of the reader the great truths which he enunciates. The late hour at which this volume came to hand, forbids that examination which it deserves, and we can only refer our readers to the book itself for a confirmation of the opinions we have thus briefly expressed.

THE WONDERS OF SCIENCE; OR, YOUNG HUMPHREY DAVY, (the Cornish Apothecary's Boy, who taught himself Natural Philosophy, and eventually became President of the Royal Society.) *The Life of a Wonderful Boy*, written for Boys. By HENRY MAYHEW, author of the "Story of the Peasant Boy Philosopher," &c. With Numerous Illustrations. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1856. 16mo. pp. 452. New Haven: T. H. Pease.

Sir Humphrey Davy, whose chemical discoveries contributed immensely to the advancement of this branch of modern science, was as remarkable in his boyhood as in his manhood. His genius and talent were both of a high order, and this story of his life by Mr. Mayhew, will be sure to strike a responsive chord in the breasts of many of our youth.

HARPERS' STORY BOOKS. A series of Narratives, Dialogues, Biographies, and Tales, for the instruction and entertainment of the Young. By JACOB ABBOTT. Embellished with numerous and beautiful Engravings. No. 18. *The Museum; or, Curiosities Explained.*

In this little volume many curious things in Natural History, Mechanics, Geography, &c., are explained for the amusement and instruction of the Young. The series will be sent regularly for three dollars a year, and the postage is only a trifle. It is a cheap and beautiful present for good little boys and girls.

LARDNER'S ONE THOUSAND AND TEN THINGS WORTH KNOWING.—A book clearly explaining how to do rightly almost everything that can be necessary in the Kitchen, the Parlor, and the Dressing Room, with Maxims, Receipts, &c., &c., &c. New York: H. Long & Brother. 1856. 12mo. pp. 143.

LYRA APOSTOLICA.—First American, from the Fifth English Edition. New York: Thomas W. Stanford. 1856. pp. 262.

A series of poetical compositions, reprinted from the British Magazine, in which they originally appeared. These poems, designed to illustrate important Christian truths, are many of them of great excellence, and will richly repay an attentive perusal.

The following Pamphlets, &c., have been received:

BISHOP DOANE'S SERMON; "The Church for Use," at the Institution of the Rev. J. W. Shackelford, Newark, N. J. Feb 12, 1856.

REV. S. L. SOUTHARD'S SERMON ON "The Christian Measure," in St. John's Church Buffalo, N. Y.

REV. J. H. MORRISON'S SERMON, "A Plea for Confirmation," in St. Peter's Church, Baltimore, Feb. 17, 1856.

REV. THOMAS S. BACON'S SERMON; "A Defense of Street Preaching;" in Trinity Church, Natchitoches, La., Advent Sunday, 1855.

PARISH STATISTICS OF CHRIST CHURCH, ELIZABETHTOWN, N. J., and Third Annual Address of the Rector, (Rev. Eugene Aug. Hoffman.)

CATALOGUE OF THE BERKELEY DIVINITY SCHOOL, at Middletown, Conn. 1856.

In this young and promising Institution there are in all eight Professors and Teachers, and already nineteen Students. Its facilities for thorough study and effective training are unsurpassed by any similar Institution in the country.


REV. F. H. CUMINGS' DISCOURSE, "The Prosperity of the Church promoted by Wardens and Vestrymen and other members of the Church;" in St. Mark's Church, Grand Rapids, Mich. Second Edition. 1856.

We copy the Appendix to this valuable Discourse, as follows, on the "Duties of Wardens and Vestrymen."

The duties of Wardens and Vestrymen are thus summarily defined in an early number of the Churchman's Magazine, published in New Haven, Connecticut. The duties of Wardens are,

1. To provide for the church a Prayer-Book and Bible of suitable size, at the expense of the parish.
2. To make the usual collections in the church.
3. To provide, at the expense of the parish, fine white bread and good wholesome wine for the Lord's Supper.
4. To provide a book of records, in which to enter, in the absence of a Rector, the names of persons baptized, married, or buried, with the date.
5. To present to the Bishop, or the chairman of the standing committee, every Priest and Deacon who has voluntarily relinquished his sacerdotal office, and uses the employments belonging to laymen.
6. To take care that the church be kept clean, and in good repair; and to preserve order during divine service.
7. To see that persons resort to church.
8. To prevent idle persons remaining in the churchyard, or about the doors of the church, during divine service.
9. To give an account to the Corporation of the church, if it has no treasurer, at the expiration of the year, of all moneys received and expended.

The duty of Vestrymen, or Trustees, is to transact all the temporal business of the church; to collect money stipulated to be paid to the minister, and at the expiration of the year if there be a deficiency, to give information thereof to the congregation, and if necessary to enforce the payment.

 NOTE.—We are compelled to omit a large number of Book Notices, prepared for this number of the Review.

ECCLESIASTICAL REGISTER.

SUMMARY OF HOME INTELLIGENCE.

ORDINATIONS.

DEACONS.

| <i>Name.</i> | <i>Bishop.</i> | <i>Time.</i> | <i>Place.</i> |
|-----------------------|----------------|--------------|-----------------------------------|
| Benton, M. B. | DeLancey, | April 6. | Trinity, Geneva, W. N. Y. |
| Birdsall, E. | Upfold, | June 4, | St. Paul's, Richmond, Indiana. |
| Curtis, J. M. | Smith, | May 23, | St. John's, Louisville, Ky. |
| Dalton, Asa | Clark, | May 18, | Zion, Newport, R. I. |
| Davidson, W. F. | Cobbs, | March 28, | St. Paul's, Selma, Ala. |
| Davies, T. F. | Williams, | May 18, | Christ, Middletown, Ct. |
| Egar, John H. | Kemper, | May 18, | St. Sylvanus, Delafield, Wis. |
| Gregory, Luther, | Kemper, | May 18, | St. Sylvanus, Delafield, Wis. |
| Howard, R. S. | Burgess, | March 27, | St. Paul's, Brunswick, Me. |
| Hopkins, Wm. C. | Hopkins, | June 4, | St. Paul's, Burlington, Vt. |
| Jones, Lucius H. | Williams, | May 18, | Christ, Middletown, Ct. |
| Jope, Robert, | Johns, | March 16, | Chapel, Theological Seminary, Va. |
| Leffingwell, C. S. | Williams, | May 18, | Christ, Middletown, Ct. |
| McAuley, Wm. | Elliott, | May 12, | St. James', Marietta, Geo. |
| Peck, J. M. | Williams, | May 18, | Christ, Middletown, Ct. |
| Sever, W. W. | Eastburn, | March 19, | St. James', Roxbury, Mass. |
| Sellwood, James R. W. | Davis, | April 2, | St. Michael's, Charleston, S. C. |
| Seymour, Charles H. | Williams, | May 5, | St. Michael's, Litchfield, Ct. |
| Smith, T. H. | Johns, | April 27, | St. John's, Wheeling, Va. |
| Stryker, A. P. | Whittingham, | March 16, | Emmanuel Parish, Cumberland, Md. |
| Thompson, H. M. | Kemper, | May 18, | St. Sylvanus, Delafield, Wis. |
| Williams, Selham, | Burgess, | May 18, | Christ, Gardiner, Maine. |
| Wood, H. G. | DeLancey, | May 25, | Zion, Rome, W. N. Y. |
| Wood, Robert, | McCoskry, | June 4, | Detroit, Mich. |

PRIESTS.

| <i>Name.</i> | <i>Bishop.</i> | <i>Time.</i> | <i>Place.</i> |
|----------------------|----------------|--------------|------------------------------------|
| Rev. Atkinson, John, | Whittingham, | May 28, | St. Paul's, Baltimore, Md. |
| " Anthon, Edward, | Eastburn, | March 27, | St. Thomas', Taunton, Mass. |
| " Babcock, J. H. | Potter, H. | June 7, | Christ, Ballston Spa, N. Y. |
| " Beers, H. W. | Lee, H. W. | May 29, | St. John's, Dubuque, Iowa. |
| " Brainard, John, | Whittingham, | May 18, | St. Paul's, Baltimore, Md. |
| " Colburn, E. A. | Whittingham, | May 18, | St. Paul's, Baltimore, Md. |
| " Chase, R. F. | Eastburn, | May 14, | St. James', Salisbury Mills, Mass. |
| " Claxton, W. J. | McIlvaine, | March 14, | Trinity, Columbus, Ohio. |
| " Dickinson, L. R. | Clark, | May 18, | Zion, Newport, R. I. |
| " French, Louis, | Williams, | March 30, | St. Peter's, Milford, Ct. |
| " Gibson, Frederick, | Whittingham, | May 28, | St. Paul's, Baltimore, Md. |
| " Garrison, Jos. F. | Doane, | June 15, | St. Paul's, Camden, N. J. |
| " Hochuly, John, | McIlvaine, | March 14, | Trinity, Columbus, Ohio. |

| <i>Name.</i> | <i>Bishop.</i> | <i>Time.</i> | <i>Place.</i> |
|----------------------|----------------|--------------|--------------------------------|
| Rev. Kendig, Daniel, | Potter, A. | June 1, | St. Paul's, Chester, Penn. |
| " Morrell, H. H. | Mellvaine, | March 14, | Trinity, Columbus, Ohio. |
| " Pattison, E. C. | Uptold, | June 4, | St. Paul's, Richmond, Indiana. |
| " Pinkerton, S. J. | Elliott, | May 11, | St. James', Marietta, Geo. |
| " Patterson, Geo. | Atkinson, | April 27, | Holy Trinity, Hertford, N. C. |
| " Thrall, G. E. | Lee, A. | March 14, | Epiphany, Philadelphia, Penn. |
| " Trimble, James, | Lee, H. W. | May 29, | St. John's, Dubuque, Iowa. |
| " Wallace, J. S. | Smith, | March 16, | St. Paul's, Louisville, Ky. |
| " Walden, J. T. | Doane, | May 19, | Trinity, Newark, N. J. |
| " Williams, Wm. H. | Williams, | May 21, | St. Mark's, New Canaan, Ct. |
| " Williamson, T. W. | Potter, A. | June 8, | St. James', Pittsburg, Pa. |

CONSECRATIONS.

| <i>Name.</i> | <i>Bishop.</i> | <i>Time.</i> | <i>Place.</i> |
|----------------------|----------------|--------------|---------------------------------|
| Christ, | Johns, | April 20, | Clarksburg, Va. |
| Christ, | Meade, | June 7, | Ronoke Parish, Halifax Co., Va. |
| Grace, | Potter, H. | April 10, | Williamsburg, N. Y. |
| Messiah, | Davis, | April 18, | North Santee, S. C. |
| St. Andrew's, | McCoskry, | March 18, | Ann Arbor, Michigan. |
| St. James', | Elliott, | Feb. 10, | Great Ogechee, Geo. |
| St. John's, | Williams, | April 10, | Warehouse Point, Ct. |
| St. John's, | Uptold, | June 5, | Hillsborough, Indiana. |
| St. John Chrysostom, | Kemper, | May 10, | Delafield, Wis. |
| St. Luke's, | DeLancey, | May 8, | Jamestown, W. N. Y. |
| St. Paul's, | Williams, | May 20, | Fairfield, Ct. |
| St. Stephen's, | Doane, | May 31, | Beverly, N. J. |
| St. Thomas', | Potter, H. | April 15, | Ravenswood, N. Y. |
| Trinity, | Potter, H. | June 17, | Haverstraw, N. Y. |

OBITUARY.

The Rev. HIRAM R. HARROLD, Rector of St. Anne's Church, Middletown, Delaware, died April 28th, 1856, aged 53 years.

Mr. Harrold was taken away, after a short but severe illness, having officiated on Sunday, April 20, in his own Church, apparently in his usual health. On the Tuesday following, he was attacked with pneumonia, which proved fatal in less than a week.

The Episcopal Recorder says:

"Mr. Harrold enjoyed the esteem of a large circle of friends, and the respect and affection of his parishioners. He was diligent in the performance of the duties of his sacred office, and for many years cheerfully underwent labors from which many men of fewer years and more robust health would have shrunk.

"He had been for about twenty-two years in the ministry of the Episcopal Church, which he entered from convictions of duty, having previously ministered in connection with the Protestant Methodist Communion. The greater part of his ministerial life was spent in the Diocese of New Jersey, where he left behind him abiding monuments of his zeal, energy and perseverance. In 1849 he removed to Delaware, and took charge of the ancient and interesting parish of St. Anne's, officiating also for several years in Christ Church, Delaware City. During his ministry, the latter church, which he found unfinished, was completed, and St. Anne's Parish has been improved by the addition of a beautiful and convenient parsonage. The intelligence of his sudden decease occasioned general sorrow, and drew forth many evidences of affection on the part of the community in which he resided."

Bishop Doane in his Address to the late Convention in the Diocese of New Jersey, paid a warm and beautiful tribute to the memory of Mr. Harrold, from which we make the following extracts:

"HIRAM R. HARROLD was born in Trenton, New Jersey, August 20, 1803. His ancestors were of the Church of England; but through his immediate

parentage, he was of the Methodist connection; and, at 16, became openly a member of it. Ten years after that, he left that body, and became a Protestant Methodist; and, subsequently, one of their ministers. The reason for this change was symptomatic of the next. He could not see how John Wesley, but a presbyter, could originate a higher than presbyterial authority; or, how a Bishop could proceed from Presbyters. His private journal, under date, September 20, 1834, contains the following record:—"I was providentially led to read Cooke's Essays on Episcopacy. I found his arguments so powerful, as not to be gainsaid; and I was most reluctantly, and against my will, persuaded of the divine origin and Apostolic succession of Episcopacy. I was induced, in consequence of such convictions, to seek an interview with G. W. Doane, Bishop of the diocese of New Jersey. I this day met him in the city of Philadelphia, and the interview was all that I expected. * * * *

"Mr. Harrold was a remarkable man. If he had been thoroughly educated, the world would have known it better. He was a natural mathematician. He reasoned logically. His taste for poetry was fine. And he held his faculties and his attainments in a beautiful equipoise. He was not quick; but sure. What he knew, he knew well; and knew how to use. He was a keen observer of men and things; and the shrewdest remarker. He loved study; and lost no opportunity for it. To borrow a good book; to read it carefully, more than once, and get all that was in it; and then to return it, rather better than worse for his use of it, was the habit of his life. He loved to teach; and was a good teacher. In every way that he could, he promoted good learning.

"His illness was severe and short. It permitted no expression of his dying hopes. Its few utterances were devotional, and full of comfort. But he needed not the preparation of a death-bed nor its tokens. He had lived a Christian life. For twenty years he had been a missionary and a pastor. The companions of his life were the Bible and Prayer Book, and saintly Bishop Wilson's *Sacra Privata*; and he suffered nothing to prevent his daily reading in them. His latest sermon was, most appropriately, from these words of the beloved Disciple: 'If any man sin, we have an advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the Righteous.' This had been the strength and consolation of his life. This was the testimony of his death. His funeral took place on Wednesday, 30th April."

DIED, at St. James' Rectory, Hyde Park, N. Y., on Whitsunday, May 11th, the Rev. RUBEN SHERWOOD, D. D., in his sixty-seventh year.

Dr. Sherwood, was one of the oldest clergymen of the Church, in Dutchess County, and for the last twenty-two years of his life, was the esteemed Rector of St. James' Church, Hyde Park. He was formerly for many years Rector of the Church in Norwalk, Connecticut, and founded the Parishes at Saugerties and Esopus, New York. The Church Journal pays the following tribute to his memory:

"Dr. Sherwood's departure removes a landmark from among the clergy of this Diocese. His position of simple, straight-forward, single-hearted performance of what he believed to be *duty, on principle*, gained him the highest respect of all, even of those who most widely differed from him. All will grieve that the upright vigor of his hoary head, the firm Roman energy of his manly profile, the gentle strength of his calm blue eye, shall no more be seen among us; and that the tones of his voice—slow, distinct, deliberate, yet tremulous with intense earnestness of emotion—shall no longer be heard in the Councils of the Church. Few have passed as scathless as he, through the most exciting controversies of our day: few retire to rest crowned with higher honor in the hearts of all whom he leaves behind."

After the funeral, on the 15th of May, the clergy, a large number of whom were present, met as a body, and passed resolutions as a mark of respect for their departed brother.

The Rev. GEORGE ADIE, late Rector of St. James' Church, Shelburne Parish,

Leesburg, Va., died at Greenwood, near Leesburg, May 3d. We extract from an obituary in the *Southern Churchman*, the following:

"For nearly a quarter of a century Mr. Adie has lived in our midst, as an irreproachable pattern of all that was good and manly and lovely in life. Coming among us twenty-five years ago, fresh with his commission to preach a gospel which he has lived, he has at length sealed his testimony to its truth and excellency, by a death as free from distress and gloom, as peaceful and lovely as the tenderest affection could have wished for him.

Gentleness, meekness, charity, a delicate instinctive shrinking from aught that was selfish or ostentatious; a lover of peace, and yet a fearless boldness in duty were the prevailing traits of his character. As a friend he was sincere and steadfast, forgiving and conciliating. As an adviser he was calm and judicious.

As a minister, he was beloved and revered by his brethren. They could not but love him, in that harmonious intercourse which has so long continued. Standing long as an older brother among the fathers of Israel, his well known face will no longer be seen in our Convention meetings, where he was always joyfully welcomed. His influence there was like the influence of the sun, quiet but strong.

At home, in his own church, his beloved St. James, his services have been acceptable and useful, till disease and weakness caused him again and again to resign his charge. Up to within a few weeks, he continued to preach in the church made vacant by his last resignation. How could he live and yet not proclaim that gospel which was the warrant of all his hopes of happiness. But his ministrations in these earthly tabernacles are at an end. As a king and priest washed in the blood of the Lamb, he serves before the altar in the heavenly sanctuary, night and day. His body sleeps under the shadow of the church in the green fresh sod on which so often he trod, but the glorified spirit is mingling in scenes of celestial brightness."

The Rev. JOHN K. HELMUTH, Assistant at St. James the Less, Falls of Schuylkill, died, April 27th.

The Rev. BREED BATCHELLER died, in the city of Baltimore, on Sunday morning, April 30th, aged 49 years. Mr. B. was a graduate of Dartmouth College—and for many years engaged in teaching, partly in Pendleton, S. C., and afterwards in Philadelphia. Having relinquished a handsome support from this source to devote himself to the ministry, he was ordained by Bp. A. Potter in 1846—7. He was settled for nearly two years at Radnor, Pa., and four years at Stanton, Delaware. For the last few years, he has resided in Maryland, but unable from ill health to discharge the duties of his sacred office.

DIED, at Nashotah, on Whitsunday, Rev. SAMUEL JOSIAH HAYWARD, B. D., a graduate of the Institution. One who knew him well writes:—

"Mr. Hayward was a young man at the time of his death, but of great acquirements and learning. He was a man of high moral worth and great strength of character. Respected and beloved by all that knew him, his considerate and childlike faith made him still more esteemed: and the hopes of many dwelt upon him as one that would do great things for the cause of Christ our Saviour and His Church.

"But their hopes were disappointed. He was attacked by consumption, and after spending a year and a half at the South, (in the Diocese of Mississippi, where he endeared himself to Bishop Green, and received much kindness from him,) without amendment of the disease, he hurried back, as he said, 'to die at Nashotah.' In the house of the Rev. Dr. Cole he spent the last two weeks of his life, attended and cared for as a brother by his family and the students of the Institution. His death was calm, without pain or struggle, in the peace of God and the full hope of a blessed resurrection. Let my soul be with his."

DIED, at Liverpool, Medina County, Ohio, on the 16th of April, JUSTUS WARNER, at the age of 100 years and 20 days, in Communion with the Protestant Episcopal Church. Mr. Warner was born in Waterbury, Connecticut, and confirmed by Bishop Seabury, first American Bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Church. His father, Ebenezer Warner, who attained the age of 94, was one of the number who aided in erecting the first Episcopal Church in Waterbury, in 1742.

THE LEGAL CUSTODY OF THE DEAD.

The novel and interesting question of the *legal right in a grave*, has recently arisen in New York, under the following circumstances:

In 1853, the Corporation of the City of New York, in certain legal proceedings for widening Beekman street, from Park-row to Nassau street, took a portion of the cemetery of the Brick Presbyterian Church. The land thus taken embraced twelve private vaults for interment, and about eighty graves, and the sum awarded for it was \$28,000.

The daughter of a person who had been buried in one of these vaults, and whose remains were duly identified by her, claimed the legal right to their custody, and to be indemnified out of the fund for the expense of re-interring them in a separate grave.

The questions arising thereon were submitted by the Supreme Court, to Hon. Samuel B. Ruggles, as Referee, and his decision was subsequently confirmed in all respects by the Court. The general question presented, was this: Who is legally and primarily entitled to the custody of a dead body? and, as a necessary result, Who is legally bound to bury it? and, further, if a body be ejected from its place of burial, who, then, is legally and primarily entitled to its custody, and who is bound to rebury it?

The Referee, in his report, which is very long and elaborate, reviews the whole subject, with great wealth of illustration and authority, and concludes with presenting the following legal principles:

I. That neither a corpse, nor its burial, is legally subject in any way, to ecclesiastical cognizance, nor to sacerdotal power of any kind.

II. That the right to bury a corpse and to preserve its remains is a legal right, which the Courts of Law will recognize and protect.

III. That such right, in the absence of any testamentary disposition, belongs exclusively to the next of kin.

IV. That the right to protect the remains includes the right to preserve them by separate burial, to select the place of sepulture, and to change it at pleasure.

V. That if the place of burial be taken for public use, the next of kin may claim to be indemnified for the expense of removing and suitably re-interring the remains.

LOUISIANA.—THE MEMORIAL QUESTION.

As everything relating to the "Memorial question," is of grave importance, affecting the interests of the Church in the United States, more seriously, perhaps, than any other that has been offered for her consideration, since she first assumed an independent ecclesiastical position, we give entire, the resolutions upon this subject, reported by a Committee to the recent Diocesan Convention of Louisiana. This Committee were appointed at the Convention of that Diocese in 1855, for the purpose of considering and drafting replies to the circular of the Commission of Bishops.

Premising in their report, that weighty considerations alone should influence the Church to modify in any important particular, formularies of devotion, which have already proved so effective, and become endeared by long usage, and that the situation of the Church in Louisiana, amidst a people so diversi-

fied, seems to render her experience of special value, the Committee report the following resolutions:

Resolved, As the judgment of this Convention, that, in view of the actual position of our Church with reference to the great moral and social necessities of the day, the period has arrived for the adoption of measures to meet these moral exigencies "more comprehensive than any provided for by our present ecclesiastical system," and that we repose the utmost confidence in the discretion of the Committee of Bishops, to whom this subject was referred by the House of Bishops, to suggest such wise and temperate measures with respect to the important matters presented in the "Memorial of Sundry Presbyters," as shall secure the general approbation of the Church, and promote her efficiency.

Resolved, That while this Convention, composed as it is of clergy and laity, assembled from different parts of the Diocese, without sufficient opportunity for mutual conference and careful deliberation, are not prepared to pronounce a specific judgment in answer to all the important questions presented in the circular, they would, nevertheless, embrace the occasion to record their conviction, that changes might be made in the liturgical services of the church, which, without touching any point of apostolic order, or doctrinal purity, as taught in her standards, would contribute towards a more perfect adaptation of her system "to the great social and moral necessities of the day," and so to make that system more efficient, and at the same time, render the public worship of the Church more varied and attractive—to wit: in answer to the questions embraced under the first number of the second division of the Bishop's Circular:

(a.) By shortening and dividing the morning service, leaving to the discretion of the minister, to use the Ante-Communion Service, except on occasions when the Communion is to be administered, allowing the minister a privilege when the Lord's Supper is to be celebrated to omit what is called "Morning Prayer," beginning the Service with the Lord's Prayer and the Ante-Communion Service, according to early usage; allowing discretion in the use of the Litany.

(b.) By adapting the Lessons, Anthems, &c., better to the different ecclesiastical seasons.

(c.) By supplying a larger number of special services, and prayers, for special seasons.

(d.) By admitting larger discretion in the use of hymns to be provided by the General Convention.

(e.) By providing services especially fitted for missionary work, at home and abroad.

(f.) By allowing the authorities of each Diocese larger liberty.

Resolved, That a readjustment of the Psalter in such wise, that the portion appointed for each day of the month should comprise psalms as nearly as possible of like character, penitential, jubilant, &c., would, in the opinion of this Convention, add much to the beauty of that part of the public service, and contribute to the edification of the congregation.

These resolutions, after a long and animated discussion, were adopted, with some amendments, of which the following were the chief:

1. That the minister's discretion in the use of the Litany, be subject to the approbation of the Bishop of the diocese.

2. That no step ought to be taken, which will, in the slightest degree, directly or indirectly touch or even tend to touch, any point of order or doctrine, as now taught in the standards of the Church.

We append, also, Resolutions upon the same subject, passed by the Convention of the Diocese of Pennsylvania, by a unanimous vote, and which have been since adopted by the Convention of the Diocese of Kentucky:

Resolved, That this Convention regard with deep interest, that great subject which will engage the attention of the General Convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church at its approaching session, to wit: the feasibility of adopting some measures by which our church may be enabled to reach more effectually the masses of our population, that are as "sheep having no shepherd," and to

attract them to her worship, and moreover, to diffuse her divine and sacred endowments more widely among those who profess and call themselves Christians.

Resolved, That the objects above contemplated, are, in the judgment of this Convention, most desirable in themselves—that they appeal to the liveliest sympathies of the Christian heart, and that their grave consideration by the Chief Council of our church, will be an omen of present and prospective good.

Resolved, That this Convention commend these objects to the earnest thought, the enlarged charity and conservative prudence of their Right Reverend Fathers and their brethren, clerical and lay, under whose contemplation they may be brought for legislative action, and invoke upon them the special guidance of the Great Head of the Church.

ROMISH CHURCH PROPERTY IN CONNECTICUT.

The Legislature of Connecticut in 1855, enacted that no grant, conveyance, lease or devise of personal or real estate, to any person and his successor or successors in any ecclesiastical office, or to any such person by the designation of any such office, should vest any estate or interest in said person or his successor. The act further provides, that all conveyances heretofore made to any person or persons in any ecclesiastical office, of real estate dedicated or appropriated to purposes of religious worship, or burial purposes, for the use of any congregation or society, shall be deemed to be held in trust for the benefit of the Society or congregation using the same, and upon the death of the person or persons who hold the title, that the same should vest in the religious corporation formed by the congregation occupying such estate—provided such a legally organized corporation should be in existence at the decease of the person holding the title. And further, that if no such incorporated religious society existed, that such real estate should vest in the State of Connecticut.

Since the loss of the Romish Bishop of the Diocese of Hartford, in the Pacific, has been ascertained, the question has arisen, what effect this act would have upon Romish Church property in this State. As none of the societies were incorporated at the time of the Bishop's death, it would appear that all the Church property became vested, at his death, in the State.

But the fifth section provides, that whenever such real estate shall vest in the State, it shall be the duty of the Treasurer of the State, upon being satisfied of the due incorporation of the congregation or society, who have occupied such real estate, to grant and convey the same, and all the right, title and interest of the State therein to said corporation. The result therefore of the law is to compel all Romish religious societies, if they would retain their property, to organize themselves, pursuant to the provisions of the State law, in the same manner as all other religious societies. At the same time, it effectually excludes the Romish Bishop and clergy from all legal control over the Church property, and places the temporalities of the Church where they should be, in the hands of the congregation. Such a result is certainly more in consonance with the spirit of our free and Republican institutions; and the Romish laity, if they are wise, will embrace this opportunity to free themselves from priestly control in matters of this kind.

OREGON.—THE SELLWOOD MISSIONARIES.

The first reports which reached us of the dreadful massacre at Panama, on the 15th of April, last, led many to the melancholy conclusion that the Rev. John Sellwood, then on his way with his brother to their field of labor in Oregon, had been removed from the scene of his earthly labors. We rejoice to say that this is incorrect. The following extract from a letter of Rev. James R. W. Sellwood, will be read with interest:

"We arrived in safety at Aspinwall, about 7 o'clock A. M., of Tuesday, April

15th, and at 2 o'clock P. M. we left Aspinwall, in the cars, to proceed to Panama; and at half-past 4 we arrived there, and were waiting in the railroad depot to get our tickets registered at the office, in order to embark on the steamer, when a difficulty took place between some of our passengers and natives of this place. Relying for protection on the proper authorities, I, together with my family and brother, and a number of other passengers, sat down on the floor at the farther end of the building. After a number of shots had been fired into the building from the outside, it was broken into at the end opposite to us, when a horrible massacre took place of the few persons who were there. Expecting that quickly the same would be the fate of the whole party at the end of the building where I was sitting, it was proposed by some one to rush out of the building, when my brother opened the door which was near him, and he and my youngest son ran out, and I knew nothing of what befell them until the next morning. At the same instant myself, wife, and the remainder of my children, in company with a number of my fellow-passengers, rushed out of the building through a doorway on the opposite side to which my brother and youngest son went out. We walked but a short distance, when we were stopped by an armed mob, who made all of us instantly sit on the ground, at the same time brandishing their large knives, and other weapons, over our heads, till I expected every one of us would be instantly killed; and I have no doubt they would have carried out their murderous purpose, had it not been for a man with a lace cap, who kept them in check for a few minutes, when we were permitted to pass on, conducted by this officer and several of his men to the governor's house, where we remained until the next morning. As soon as we were led out, I went (having procured a soldier as my guard) in search of my son and brother. I soon found my son. He had been taken to the house of a friend, by natives, and had only received a slight blow on the back of his head, and the loss of his hat. We then went to search for my brother. I went to the depot where I was told the dead were. I there saw twelve of the dead, but it was impossible to recognize him by features, if he had been there—they were so cut, swollen, and bloody. I found, by examining, that their clothing was not the kind my brother had on. I then went to a house where the wounded were, and found him, but did not know him, he was so swollen, bruised, and bloody; but, thanks to a kind Providence, he was sensible and knew my voice. His sad tale was this; when he opened the door he stepped out on the platform, and jumped from it to the ground, when he was surrounded by persons who struck him two or three blows on the forehead and face with a piece of wood. He also received a pistol-shot near the left breast. When he fell to the ground, they immediately drew their knives, and ripped up his clothes, and cut off portions of them, and robbed him of all he had about his person, and then left him. Both his hands are also severely injured,—when that took place is unknown to him,—his right hand being badly burned with powder, and the left hand supposed to be grazed by a ball. His wounds are all doing well. Myself and family are stopping at a hotel, by order of Colonel Ward, the American Consul. We are robbed of all our money, and also the mission funds, likewise hats, caps, bonnets, umbrellas—in fact, every thing we had in our hands."

At the last accounts Rev. Mr. S. was convalescing, and expecting soon to resume his journey. While in the hospital at Panama, a letter was dictated by him to Rev. Dr. Bedell. In response to an appeal for their aid, noble and liberal offerings were promptly made, to cheer these penniless Missionaries and enable them to proceed on their work of faith and love.

SUMMARY OF FOREIGN INTELLIGENCE.

ENGLAND.

MEETING OF CONVOCATION AGAIN.

The reports of the meetings of the Convocation of the Province of Canterbury, are becoming some of the most important of our English intelligence.

Convocation reassembled on the 15th of April, when there were present ten Bishops, and in the Lower House a large attendance. The Prolocutor and several members of the Lower House, presented an elaborate report on the state of the law affecting the discipline of the clergy, drawn up by a committee of the Lower House, appointed, by order of his Grace the President, at the session held February 1, 1856, which was thoroughly debated.

The *Bishop of Lichfield* presented a petition numerously and most respectfully signed, both by laymen and clergymen of the Church of England, praying that the two houses would be pleased to take into their consideration the adoption of such measures as might seem expedient for bringing about the restoration of the Wesleyan Methodists to the communion of the Church of England. This subject also received respectful and earnest attention. The *Bishop of Lichfield* presented also a similar petition, numerously signed by clergymen of the diocese of London.

The *Bishop of Winchester* read the following "representation" from certain members of the Lower House of Convocation:

"To his Grace the President, and their Lordships the Bishops, of the Convocation of the Province of Canterbury.

"The humble representation of the following members of the Lower House of Convocation—

"We desire to unite with your lordships in expressions of devout thankfulness to Divine Providence for the restoration of peace.

"At the same time we beg leave to acknowledge your paternal care for the spiritual welfare of our fellow-subjects in the East during the late war.

"We desire also to record our gratitude for the encouragement given by your Grace and some of your lordships, to a pious work now in progress—the erection of an English Church at Constantinople.

"We hail this undertaking as an auspicious event, which promises, with the divine blessing, to diffuse the benefits of the Gospel, and to promote the peace of Christendom.

"We would humbly submit to your lordships' consideration, that, for the attainment of these ends, it might be desirable that the foundation of the proposed Church at Constantinople, shall be accompanied with a communication from this Synod, expressive of sentiments of Christian fellowship, to the Bishops and clergy of the Eastern Church, and with such other demonstrations as, in your lordships' judgment, might seem most conducive to promote the cause of true religion and Christian unity, and to represent the Church of England to our Eastern fellow-Christians in her true character as a pure and apostolic branch of the Universal Church of Christ." (Signed)

"Anthony Grant, Archdeacon of St. Albans.

Chr. Wordsworth, D. D., Proctor for the Chapter of Westminster.

Thomas Thorp, B. D., Archdeacon of Bristol.

George Wilkins, D. D., Archdeacon of Nottingham.

James Wayland Joyce, Proctor, Hereford.

E. Harold Browne, Proctor for the Diocese of Exeter.

Henry Caswall, Proctor for the Diocese of Salisbury.

F. C. Massingberd, Proctor for the Diocese of Lincoln.
 J. Bartholomew, Archdeacon of Barnstable.
 George A. Denison, Archdeacon of Taunton.
 William Selwyn, Proctor for the Chapter of Ely.
 R. W. Jelf, Proctor for Christ Church, Oxford.
 Edward Bickersteth, Archdeacon of Buckingham.
 George Martin, Proctor for the Chapter of Exeter.
 James Duke Coleridge, D.C.L., Proctor for the Diocese of Exeter.
 Henry Moore, Archdeacon of Stafford.
 William Bruere Otter, Archdeacon of Lewes.
 Robert Hussey, B.D., Proctor for the Diocese of Oxford."

These were among the most important matters brought before Convocation; and after *three days* of free, and often spirited discussion, Convocation was prorogued to August 28th. The whole tone of the meeting was different from that exhibited in the earlier meetings of which we gave an account two years ago. There is still, however, the presence of an impracticable "*dog-in-the-manger*" spirit; in other words, there are large numbers of men who are terribly afraid the Church is not so thoroughly and dignifiedly dead and laid out in state for burial as they supposed. Good temper characterized the whole meeting; no unpleasant collision took place; and the general business of the meeting seemed to fall into those hands which were best able to conduct it.

The *London Record* speaks of Convocation in the following strain: "The Convocation of the clergy for the province of Canterbury, is again at work, maintaining its groundless and mischievous usurpation of the character belonging to a general Convocation of the Church of England. Whatever of plain good sense has been exercised on the present occasion, has been shown by the Lower House, while the usual despotic assumption and spirit of intolerance have marked the proceedings of the Upper Chamber."

"For the Lower House, we confess a kind of ludicrous pity. Did it really represent the general body of the Church of England, that pity would be changed into indignation; for it would present to the world a picture of helpless weakness which might well excite the wonder of mankind, and for which it would be difficult to find a parallel."

The attempt to restore to Convocation the exercise of its legitimate functions, is shared by men of different shades of opinion; who feel the necessity of rescuing the Church from the grasp of a Body like Parliament, made up more and more of Romanists, Jews, Heretics, Latitudinarians, &c., &c.

INCREASE OF THE EPISCOPATE IN ENGLAND.

Attention is now directed to the important subject of the increase of the Episcopate in England. The *Colonial Church Chronicle* for April has the following statistics:

The great necessity that exists for an increase in the Episcopate in England, will at once appear, when we state that on an average, every Bishop in England has nearly 270,000 *more* souls under his spiritual care, *than any other Bishop in any other Christian country in Europe*, whilst the population of some of our Dioceses, committed to the pastoral care of *one Bishop*, is equal to some European kingdoms! and in one case exceeds several of them.

Thus the number of souls contained in 1851 in the Diocese of London was 2,143,340, (to be increased on the next voidance of the see of Winchester to 2,588,718,) in that of Manchester 1,395,494, in that of Chester 1,183,497, in that of Winchester 1,080,412, in that of Ripon 1,033,457, and in that of Lichfield 1,022,080. Compare this with the population of some of the minor European kingdoms. In 1850 Saxony contained 1,836,433 inhabitants, Hanover 1,758,856, Württemberg, 1,743,827, and the Grand Duchy of Baden 1,349,930. Can any stronger argument be drawn in favor of an increase in an Episcopate than a comparison of these statistics affords? We think not. We leave them without remark, to speak for themselves.

The following statistics are chiefly taken from the Report of the Cathedral Commission :

| | Bishops. | Souls in 1851. | Average in each Bishopric. |
|---------------------------------|--------------|----------------------|-------------------------------|
| England and Wales has | 27 | 18,018,348 | 667,346 |
| France | 82 | 33,000,000 | 400,000 |
| Bavaria | 8 | 3,000,000 | 375,000 |
| Austria | 78 | 28,000,000 | 358,000 |
| Sweden | 13 | 3,000,000 | 230,000 |
| Spain | 59 | 12,000,000 | 203,000 |
| Portugal | 22 | 2,500,000 | 113,000 |
| Sardinian States | 40 | 4,600,000 | 110,000 |
| The Two Sicilies | 24 | 8,500,000 | 106,000 |
| Free Greece | 24 | 1,000,000 | 41,666 |

In the time of William the Conqueror the number of Episcopal sees in England was twenty-one, the population about 1,250,000—average to each see 180,000. We have now, including Sodor and Man, (1856,) twenty-eight Bishoprics, with a population exceeding nineteen millions—average to each Diocese 678,574.

UNION OF THE ENGLISH WESLEYANS WITH THE ENGLISH CHURCH.

At the close of last year a meeting was held at St. James' Rectory, Piccadilly, at which the desirableness of union amongst Christians was discussed. The result was that a few of the clergymen and gentlemen present were requested to consider and report "what measures it may be expedient to take for promoting union with the Church of England on the part of Christians not at present in active communion with her." The following committee was appointed, including four names which were added subsequently:—

Chairman.—Rev. J. E. KEMPE, Rector of St. James', Westminster.

Rev. R. Burgess, Prebendary of St. Paul's, and Rector of Upper Chelsea; Rev. Dr. Hessey, Preacher to the Hon. Society of Gray's-inn, and Head Master of Merchant Taylor's School; Rev. Ernest Hawkins, Prebendary of St. Paul's, and Minister of Curzon Chapel, Mayfair; Rev. Lord C. A. Harvey, Rector of Chertford, Essex; Rev. J. W. Ayre, Incumbent of St. Mark's, North Audley street; Henry Hoare, Esq., 14 New street, Spring gardens; T. Chambers, Esq., M. P., 7 Cumberland Place, Hyde-park; Rev. Henry Alford, Minister of Quebec Chapel; Rev. J. Lawrell, Incumbent of St. Matthew's, City Road; Rev. W. H. Hoare, Oakfield, Crawley, Sussex. *Hon. Secs.*—Rev. J. Paul, Incumbent of Twigworth, Gloucester; Rev. A. C. Smith, of St. Andrew's, Holborn.

By this Committee a report was made to a large meeting at St. James' Rectory, Piccadilly, on Thursday evening, March 6. The result of the conversation that ensued was the proposal of the following petition to Convocation, founded mainly on the report, and expanding the resolutions contained in it. It was then numerous signed, and will lie at Messrs. Rivington's, 3 Waterloo-Place, for general signature:

"The humble Petition of the undersigned Clergy and Laity of the Church of England to the Most Rev. the Archbishop, the Right Rev. the Bishops, and the Rev. the Clergy of the Province of Canterbury, in Convocation assembled, sheweth—

"That your petitioners, seriously laying 'to heart the great dangers we are in, by our unhappy divisions,' and earnestly desiring a closer union among Christians, have been led in the first instance to review the causes which impede the restoration to the Church of England of one particular religious community, namely, the Wesleyan Methodists.

"That your petitioners are given to understand that among the chief difficulties in the way of such reunion are the following:—

"1. An impression on the part of the Wesleyans that the Church of England is not sufficiently careful with respect to the ordination of candidates for the ministry, or sufficiently jealous of the personal holiness of her ministers and other members.

"2. A persuasion that the Wesleyan system of 'class-meetings' would be formally disapproved by the Church of England.

"3. A strong objection to the imposition of a three years' silence on a Wesleyan minister before he can be Episcopally ordained.

"4. A suspicion that in promoting union the Church of England desires to obtain patronage, or temporal influence."

"That your petitioners desire to meet these difficulties in the spirit of Christian candor and Christian charity.

"They beg leave, therefore, humbly to represent to your two houses as follows:—

"That they desire most earnestly that every precaution should be taken to ensure personal holiness and other necessary qualifications in candidates for the sacred ministry of the Church, and that none should be admitted to holy orders but such as can answer conscientiously the questions put to every candidate in the Ordination Service—a test which, if faithfully applied, they are satisfied would secure, so far as human means can be expected to secure, an efficient and godly ministry.

"That with reference to the personal holiness of the clergy and other members of the Church of England, they would cordially rejoice if better means could be devised than at present exist for the exercise of godly discipline.

"That in the opinion of your petitioners the retention by the Wesleyans of their system of 'class-meetings' need not be an insuperable obstacle to their reunion with the Church.

"That in respect to the admission of a Wesleyan minister to the orders of the Church of England, your petitioners submit that it would be proper to retain the requirement of a three years' testimonial, so far as regards life and behavior; but as regards soundness in the faith, and general fitness for the sacred ministry, they think it desirable that the period of probation be reduced, and that no longer time be prescribed than the Bishop may require to satisfy himself on those essential points.

"That your petitioners disclaim all wish to interfere with the property or patronage of the Wesleyan body.

"That, whilst anxious for the removal of every unnecessary barrier between the Church of England and the Wesleyan Methodists, your petitioners cannot refrain from saying that they would entertain better hopes of eventual reconciliation, could the Wesleyans be induced to revert to the principles of their founder, by receiving the sacrament of the Lord's Supper in the parish church only.

"Lastly—That your petitioners desire humbly to represent to your two houses that, aiming as they do, at the restoration of union, they would heartily rejoice to see such of the Wesleyan ministers as are already in mind and spirit one with the Church of England, united to her by Episcopal ordination, and so placed in a position to co-operate with her clergy as fellow-laborers in the vineyard of their common Lord and Master.

"Your petitioners, therefore, humbly pray that your two houses will be pleased to take the premises into your serious consideration, and to advise upon such measures as to you may seem most expedient for bringing about a restoration of the Wesleyan Methodists to the communion of the Church of England.

"And your petitioners will ever pray."

ARCHBISHOP OF MALABAR IN ENGLAND.

An ecclesiastic of the Eastern Church is now in England, whose presence and errand awaken associations of much interest. It will be recollected that in

1806 the Rev. C. Buchanan, in his missionary journey to the East, found a Church on the coast of Malabar reputed to have been founded by St. Thomas, and though exposed to papal aggressions in the sixteenth century, when the Portuguese visited Southern India, yet still preserving their own integrity. Their existence and character has been regarded as furnishing an unanswerable argument on the Constitution, worship, &c., of the primitive Church. The Archbishop of that ancient branch of the Church is now in England, and the Rev. James Skinner, the gentleman whose guest he is, thus describes him:

"It was in the month of December of last year that I met Mar Athanasius Stephanos, the Archbishop and Metropolitan of Malabar, in Cairo. He was on his way to England to seek redress, at the hands of the Court of Directors of the East India Company, against the injustice of the Rajah of Travancore, the heathen prince in whose territory he exercises his jurisdiction. I will not enter into the details of his grievance. It may prejudice his interests to speak publicly of statements which have yet to be laid before the authorities. I will only say that, if I am rightly informed, they make out a case of singular hardship; and they bring before the Church at large a fresh testimony to that universal shortcoming in brotherly love to which I have referred.

But who is the Archbishop of Malabar? There is hardly any tradition so well sustained as that the Gospel was first preached in India by the Apostle St. Thomas. First in order came the conversion of Arabia Felix and the island of Zootroe; and then the Apostle planted the faith in the town of Cranganor, lying north of Cochin. And so the Church of Malabar came, in process of time, to include all the labors of the Apostle in this part of India, from Cranganor to Cape Comorin; and there is every reason to believe that it continued steadfast for some centuries in the things which it had learnt from its blessed founder.

But time wore on. And as in other parts of Christendom, so in this, the power of money wrought all manner of evil. A Syrian merchant, in the sixth or seventh century, coming with all the influence of wealth and of a coincidence in name, (Thomas,) persuaded the simple Malabarese to receive their Bishops from the Patriarchate of Antioch; and with their Bishops they received also the Nestorian heresy. Their subsequent history is one of great trouble. In the palmy days of the Indo-Portuguese Church, an attempt was made to bring them under the supremacy of Rome; but this only resulted in a violent revulsion of feeling against that communion, which abides with them to this day. It resulted, farther, in their yielding themselves up to Jacobitism, which also cleaves to them still.

The Archbishop of Malabar then, at present in England, is the appointed chief minister to the Syrian Christians in Cochin and Travancore. The Jacobite Patriarch of Antioch, residing in the Convent of Ananias, at Mardin, near Mosul, to whom the Christians of Malabar submit themselves, is his superior; and to assert this authority in his superior, and to claim the privilege to which his superior has called him, he has come to this country.

Now, Sir, I believe this prelate to be a true man. I have the testimony of competent authority—our political agent and Consul at Bagdad, Col. Rawlinson; our Vice-Consul at Mosul, Mr. Rassam; the Bishops of Calcutta, Madras, and Bombay; Mr. Kay, of Bishop's College, Calcutta; Mr. Woodrow, of La Martiniere, Calcutta, and others, who have examined his credentials, and who witness to their authenticity. And I venture to suggest that we should make him welcome amongst us, because of the common bond which binds us to Christ. He is identified with a fatal heresy, I am sure, without believing in, or so much as guessing its sin. The founder of it, Severus, repudiated the notions of Eutyches as much as we do, and he also declined to leave the dogma of one or two natures in Christ an open question. So that it may well be conceived how *simple ignorance* may be the one fault of his followers. I am solemnly persuaded that our connection with this prelate and his Church, through the East India Company, involves us in a high responsibility. I am solemnly persuaded that their adoption to the Catholic faith, *from England*, is an issue which, as it undoubtedly lies with us now, will assuredly be demanded of us "at That Day."

The Archbishop is now living with me, and attends our daily services here.

It is very striking to witness his appreciation of a higher standard of worship than that with which he has been accustomed to identify the Anglo-Indian Church, as represented at Calcutta and Madras. And this is not without its significance."

TREATY OF PEACE SIGNED.

The Treaty was signed at Paris on Sunday, March 30th, at 12 o'clock. A Council of Ministers was held at the Tuileries at half-past 11 o'clock, and remained sitting till quarter-past 12. The Emperor presided and gave his last instructions, and Count Walewski returned to his official residence to receive the Plenipotentiaries. They appeared in full uniform, and wore all their orders and decorations. They assembled in the *Salle de Conférences* before half-past 12, and after the Treaty was read over proceeded to sign it in the same alphabetical order in which they have been wont to take their places during the Conférences.

The Plenipotentiaries of France, Austria, Great Britain, Prussia, Russia, Sardinia, and Turkey, affixed their signatures to the Treaty.

When matters shall have settled down into their practical and working order, we shall then be able to see clearly who has lost, and who has gained; and where Turkey, Popery, Italy, the English Church, and the Oriental Churches stand relatively to each other and before the world. The Sultan's Firman secures entire freedom for Christians in the East; but who is to profit most by this remains to be proved, and will, doubtless, depend on the influence most predominant at Constantinople. That ultra-montane Popery is making large calculations we have sufficient evidence. Its organ in France, thus speaks:

"The best reliance for us is, therefore, that which appears to have the same interests as ourselves at Constantinople—namely, the alliance of Austria. France has a great task to accomplish in those splendid regions still submitted to the authority of the son of Mahmoud, which is to establish, by the influence of her civilization, the ascendancy of Catholicism. Her rôle is to place herself at the head of the Catholic interests in the East. United to Austria, she can perform great actions and acquire at the same time immense advantages and much glory."

Will England permit herself to be in this game a mere cat's paw of the Jesuits? Will she still join the despots of Europe in crushing Constitutional Liberty in Italy? If she dare do it, there is another and deeper game to be played nearer home.

It is noticeable that the manifesto of Alexander in announcing peace to his Russian subjects is deeply religious in its tone. It thus closes:

"The concessions are not great when put in comparison with the charges of a prolonged war, and the advantages promised to us by the tranquillity of the Empire, the destinies of which it has pleased God to intrust to us. May all those advantages be obtained by our efforts, united to those of all our faithful subjects! May, with the aid of the Almighty, who has always protected Russia, its internal organization be consolidated and perfected! May justice and clemency preside over its judgment—may the advancement of civilization and of all useful activity spread with renewed force—and may every one enjoy in peace the fruits of his labor under the protection of laws equally just and watchful for all! Finally, and this is the most important and most ardent of our hopes—may the salutary light of faith, by enlightening the mind and strengthening the heart, maintain and improve more and more that social morality which is the surest pledge of order and happiness!

Given at St. Petersburg, the 19th (31st) of March, 1856, and in the second year of our reign.

ALEXANDER."

What American President has ever borne such testimony to the Christian Faith!

The following is the substance of the Treaty as far as made known. It contains thirty-four articles:

THE FIRST restores perpetual friendship between Great Britain, Sardinia, Turkey, France, and Russia.

SECOND—All territories conquered or occupied during the war shall be reciprocally evacuated as soon as possible.

THIRD—Russia restores to Turkey Kars and other parts of the Ottoman territory.

FOURTH—The Allies restore to Russia the towns and ports of Sebastopol, Balaklava, Kamiesch, Eupatoria and Kertch. [Articles 5th, 6th, 7th and 8th are wanting.]

NINTH—The Sultan communicates to the Powers his *firman* granting equality to Christians which the contracting Powers must approve of, but divest themselves of all right thereby to interfere in the internal administration of the Government of the Ottoman Empire.

TENTH—The Convention of the 13th July, 1841, closing the Bosphorus and Dardanelles is reaffirmed.

ELEVENTH—The Black Sea is neutralized and forever forbidden to all ships of war of every Power adjoining or distant, with the exceptions specified in articles 14 and 19.

TWELFTH—Trade shall be free in the waters and ports of the Black Sea, subject only to police regulations, Russia and Turkey admitting Consuls to all ports on its shores.

THIRTEENTH—The Black Sea being neutralized, strongholds become useless—consequently Turkey and Russia agree neither to construct nor preserve any military maritime arsenals on the coast.

FOURTEENTH—The Convention regulating the force of ships for coast-service is concluded individually between Turkey and Russia, but is appended to this treaty, and cannot be altered without general assent.

FIFTEENTH—The act of the Congress of Vienna relative to river navigation is applied to the Danube and its mouths, and its freedom becomes a part of the law of the Empire.

SIXTEENTH—To carry into effect Article 15, France, Austria, Great Britain, Prussia, Russia and Turkey, appoint each a delegate to put the River in a navigable state, from Isatcha to Tza.

SEVENTEENTH—Austria, Bavaria, Turkey and Wurtemberg, each add a delegate to the Commission of the Principalities, to form a permanent Commission for the purpose of keeping the River navigable, and to superintend its police.

EIGHTEENTH—The general Commission will be dissolved in two years, and the permanent Commission take its place.

NINETEENTH—Each of the contracting Powers may station two small ships at the mouth of the Danube.

TWENTIETH—Russia assents to the rectification of the Bessarabian frontier. The new frontier starts from the Black Sea, one mile East of Lake Bournasola to the Akermann Road, along which it extends to the valley of Trajan, passing South of Belgrade, and reascending the River Yalpack to Savatsika, and terminates at Karmari on the River Pruth. Elsewhere it is unchanged.

TWENTY-FIRST—The ceded territory is annexed to Moldavia.

TWENTY-SECOND—Moldavia and Wallachia continue under the sovereignty of Turkey, with the guarantee of all the contracting Powers that no Power shall claim the individual right of interference.

TWENTY-THIRD—The Porte guarantees to the said Principalities the continuance of the freedom of religion and commerce. The contracting Powers appoint a Commission to meet immediately at Bucharest, to report on the present condition and wants of the Principalities.

TWENTY-FOURTH—The Porte will immediately convoke a Divan in each Principality to learn the wishes of the people as to their definite organization.

TWENTY-FIFTH—Minutes thereof shall be sent to Paris, where the Constitution shall be framed, which the Porte shall promulgate.

TWENTY-SIXTH—The Principalities shall maintain a militia, and may construct works of defense approved by the Porte.

TWENTY-SEVENTH—If the internal tranquillity of the Principalities be disturbed the Porte must consult the contracting Powers, and cannot employ armed intervention without their consent.

TWENTY-EIGHTH—Servia continues a dependency of the Porte under the guarantee of the Powers, and retains its national administration, and freedom of religion and trade.

TWENTY-NINTH—The right of garrison in Servia is reserved to the Porte, but no armed intervention is permitted without the consent of the Powers.

THIRTIETH—Russia and Turkey retain their possession in Asia precisely as before the war, but their frontiers are to be marked out by survey.

THIRTY-FIRST—The evacuation of Turkey by the Allied and Austrian forces shall take place as soon as convenient. The time and manner of such evacuation shall be the subject of private arrangement between each of the Powers and Turkey.

THIRTY-SECOND—Until new arrangements shall be made, trade shall go on as before the war.

THIRTY-THIRD—A convention (contents secret) concluded between France England and Russia respecting the Aland Isles, shall be appended to this treaty.

THIRTY-FOURTH—The ratifications shall be exchanged at Paris within four weeks.

REVIVAL OF POKERY IN FRANCE.

We learn from various sources that extraordinary efforts are now making to establish the most *ultra-montanism* throughout France.

Among these methods "is the revival of Triennial Synods, under the immediate sanction of Rome. The Synod of Rochelle has just published its 'Acts,' and a powerful synodal letter. It is most remarkable for its contrast to the old Gallican spirit,—a contrast which it cannot conceal by its respectful allusion to Fenelon. Absolute devotion to the 'See of St. Peter,' expressed in such extravagant terms in the council of 1850, is repeated in this; and the 'independence of the Church' remarkably asserted. Among the principal topics of the synodal letter are the most earnest persuasions, to the strict revival of 'the Sabbath.' Much of the irreligion of the people is attributed by the Synod to disregard of the Divine law which 'sanctifieth the seventh day.' The Fathers of the Council then solemnly call on the priests everywhere to set an example of Sabbath observation, and admonish 'heads of families, masters, and magistrates,—in a word, all who have received authority from God,—to use it in glorifying their Sovereign Master, and procure the observation of His Law.'"

Nor is this all. An American gentleman now in France, describes the increased attention paid to the young. He says: "The Church is devoting extraordinary attention to the children of the country. It has found that it cannot make good Papists of Frenchmen (whatever it may do with French women) unless it embues them early with its spirit. The children of both sexes, but especially boys, receive more careful attention from the French Catholic clergy than is devoted to them in any other country I have ever seen. More attention than ever is given here to the preparation of the young for their '*first communion*.' It is made a great event in families. The child is trained for it by devotional forms, and new apparel is provided for the occasion, or if the family is too poor to provide it, it is obtained, for a small sum, from shops which have it, of all sizes, and charge a small sum for its use.

"And let me remark that these assemblies, and initiations of children into the Church, are not considered here secondary religious labors, to be assigned to Sunday schools or laymen alone, but the highest solemnities, and the highest dignities of the Church give them importance. I have seen the Archbishop of Paris (the primate of all France) solemnize the mass, and deliver an address in the splendid church of the Pantheon, to a congregation of thousands of boys, apparently between the ages of ten and fifteen years.

"The Church also organizes special *societies* (like those mentioned in my last letter) for the better security of its children. It has seminaries for all grades and all pecuniary ability, and for children whose parents have no such ability. It encloses the daughters of the rich, amidst papal symbols and ceremonies, in institutions scattered all over France, of which the 'House of the Sacred Heart,' at Paris, and the 'Demoiselle d'Instruction,' at Puy, are well-known examples. Public nurseries and infant asylums abound. Two things are well taught in these Papal institutions—the legendary superstitions and formalism of Popery, on the one hand, and the detestation of Protestantism on the other. It would astonish you to read the descriptions of the latter which the juvenile books contain. Let me insert here the 'table of contents' of one of these volumes, which has been endorsed by a bishop!—

"Question I. What ought you to think of a religion which has its origin in libertinism?

Question II. What ought you to think of a religion which has spread and strengthened itself by plunder and violence?

"Question III. What ought you to think of a religion which still supports itself by the aid of violence?

"Question IV. What ought you to think of a religion which depends on falsehood and calumny?

"Question V. What ought you to think of a religion which allows its professors to believe and to do whatever they like?

"From this specimen you may infer what instructions respecting Protestantism are given to the children of France. Trained thus to abhor it, they have no refuge, when, in riper years, their own monstrous faith becomes intolerable. They plunge into the abyss of scepticism.

"The Work of the Holy Infancy extends everywhere with a marvelous rapidity. From France it now sends its beneficent branches to the British Isles, Belgium, Holland, the Rhenish Provinces, Bavaria, Poland, Italy, Switzerland, Spain, Asia, North and South America, &c.

"The churches are crowded, old ones are 'restored,' magnificent new ones are opened, religious fetes, costly pageants, abound everywhere; nearly one hundred and thirty-three thousand priests, monks and nuns are at work incessantly in all the cities and hamlets of the land; they have increased nearly one-fourth in the last twenty-five years."

Still another mode to revive Popery in France is the new zeal inspired in and by the Order of Dominicans. These are an order of mere preachers. Without parochial connection they are carefully trained to the mere business of preaching. The head of this Order now is Lacordaise, a remarkable man, and a thorough ultra-montanist. Much as we hear now-a-days about the folly of preaching, the Papists are not such dunces as to undervalue it. These itinerants thread every nook and corner of the Empire where they can gain a hearing, just as our own preachers ought to penetrate every nook and corner of our own country.

And yet to this spread of ultra-montanism there are serious obstacles. True the Bishops of France, with few exceptions, are of that school. Yet it is also true that the present *civil* despotism of France may be short-lived. It hangs upon a single thread, the life of a single man. As to this subserviency to the Pope in every thing, the intellect of France, and the genius of the people, are all against it. Many of her noblest sons are in exile, her press is under censorship, and the battle of the ancients and the moderns has been revived. The following passage from the writer above cited, is worth quoting:

"The *coup d'état* of their patron, Napoleon III, was immediately followed by their attempt to displace the classic authors, and the great French writers who copied after them, and to substitute in their place in the seminaries the Church fathers and Medieval doctors. This was simply ridiculous; and it could be nowhere more so than among the brilliant critics and authors of France. Homer and Demosthenes, Virgil and Cicero, Camille and Racine, Rousseau and Voltaire, Boileau and Moliere, and even Bossuet and Fenelon,

were not as good standards of style and taste as Thomas Aquinas, Chrysostom, or Augustin! In other words, the fight was for the restoration of the dark ages; for Popery knows that they alone could consist with its antiquated pretensions. The public paper of the Church, the *Univers*, has not hesitated to declare that the reign of St. Louis was the most intelligent, as well as the most happy epoch of the French, and to contrast it, in these respects, with that of Louis XIV, and the most illustrious writers of the national literature.

"The Abbe Gaume has led this controversy by his writings against the ancients and their classic French followers. He has been supported by the Bishop of Arras. The attempt, however, is so exceedingly barbarous that the Church itself has become alarmed. The more astute heads within it see that this fight against the demi-gods of literature must end like that of the Titans against the classic gods. A Bishop even (of Orleans) has stepped forth to stop it. But it has already gone far enough to stamp its disgrace indelibly upon the Ultramontane cause. It is a part of a general scheme for the permanent establishment of Popery in all the departments of French powers and French thought. It is one of the overdone blunders of Jesuitism, which will, in due time, help the reaction that shall overwhelm it."

"There is hardly one contemporary name among the priests, which can pretend to a place among the great French churchmen of the past. Bossuet, Bourdaloue, Massillon, Fenelon, Flechiere, Arnould, Pascal, still constitute the chief claim of the French Church on the consideration of intellectual Frenchmen. They have no successors. They were legitimate sons of the Gallican Church, in the day of its 'liberties,' and they (most of them) defended those liberties, and would blush for the present Ultramontaniam with which Jesuitism has bestrided the country. Their superb intellects were the product of the 'classic' era of French studies—the day of the consecrated scholarship of the Port-royalists and of the currency of the Elzevir and Delphine editions. Their names are imperial in the history of French literature—the only ones of the Church, that an intelligent Frenchman dares to quote, without a blush, in the same sentence with the great infidel names of Voltaire, Rousseau, Montesquieu, Mirabeau. Their day seems irrevocably gone in France. The priests print—print incessantly, and deluge the country with their productions, but what are they? Mostly the veriest trash of superstition—'lives of the saints,' that is histories of legends—sentimental and maudlin books of devotion—inflated and sometime quite amorous books on the favorite Mariolatry of the day."

Among the most striking proofs that the old Gallican spirit is not dead, the editors of *La Siecle*, the organ of the moderate party, recently addressed the following scorching invective to *L'Univers*, the organ of the Jesuits.

"You are the men who wrote the Code of the Inquisition, the greatest crime of human kind; who shed blood like water in the wars of the Albigenses, of the Waldenses, and of the Hussites; who butchered old men, women, and children; and said, whilst treading under foot heaps of corpses, God will know who are his; who bled Spain to death, exterminated the Moors, and proscribed the Jews; who waylaid the Protestants on St. Bartholomew's day, blessed the dagger of Jacques Clement, let loose upon Europe the thirty years' war, concocted in secret the gunpowder plot, transformed Flanders, by the hand of the Duke of Alba, into an immense slaughter-house, burnt Giordano Bruno at the stake, tortured on the rack the genius of Galileo, extorted from Louis XIV the revocation of the edict of Nantes, burnt four hundred villages in the Cevennes, signed a hundred thousand letters of cachet (warrants) against the Jansenists, condemned Calas, executed Labarre, flayed Fra Diavolo, killed at Rome Gen. Duphot, shook, in the nineteenth century, the law of sacrilege, as a trial torch of the Inquisition, and finally irritated France, during the restoration, to such a degree, that, after a long resistance, France indignantly punished you. Do you recognize yourselves in this description of your services, and in the long trail of blood you have left behind you on the road of the past? Do you begin to find out what your family name is? Your name is not religion, for religion is peace in the State, whilst, wherever you set your foot, we find noth-

ing but *discord*. No power, no people, has been able to live within the reach of your breath, without being poisoned, and vomiting you back."

Nor is this all.

"It seems ultramontanism is not to be without antagonism in France. A new paper, *L'Observateur*, Catholique, is to combat ultramontanism, 'which attacks the church in her power, rights and discipline.'"

The strength of Protestantism in France, he thus estimates. He places, of "the two great Protestant bodies which are recognized by the state in France—the 'Reformed' and the 'Lutheran'—their population at about 2,000,000, their ministers 762, their chapels 800, their theological professors (including those of Geneva) 20, their theological students 100, their annual receipts from the government \$272,000, their periodicals about 17, &c."

While he writes on the whole in a hopeful spirit, yet he makes the following confession:

"*Rationalism*, under the guise of 'Liberalism,' has been the bane of French Protestantism, as of continental Protestantism generally. It would be incredible to American Christians were I to sketch the character and prevalence of Rationalistic unbelief in Germany and France. Mr. Parker, of Boston, with his apparent earnestness of character and devotion to public philanthropies, might pass for a saint of orthodoxy by the side of some Protestant speculators in Europe. An American friend, recently here from Berlin, tells me that he attended a course of lectures, in a Protestant university, expressly against the character, personal as well as official or ecclesiastical, of Jesus Christ, and that they were delivered by a learned man, whose character was reputable for sound morals and general amiability. Christ is placed in the same class of historical characters as Confucius, Zoroaster, Socrates and Mahommed, and subjected to the same critical treatment. All sorts of critical liberties are taken, in like manner, with the sacred writings."

In respect to the preaching in Germany, he says:

"It seems scarcely credible, and yet it is distinctly asserted by Kappt, that sermons have been preached in German churches, upon the cultivation of the potatoe, the advantages and disadvantages of tobacco, the management of animals and stables, upon the seasons, the holidays, and other equally ridiculous themes."

AUSTRIA AND POPEY.—THE NEW CONCORDAT.

While Popery is fast losing ground in Italy, Spain, Sardinia, and elsewhere a new Concordat has been signed between Rome and Austria of the most sweeping character, and by which rights always held sacred by Austria have been given up. The Pope, in his Allocution of Nov. 3, is in ecstasies over the matter.

An account of the Concordat between Rome and Austria has been given in two papers, the *Gazetta di Venezia* and the *Paris Univers*. According to the former, translated from the German by the Vienna correspondent of the *Times*, the document contains the following twenty-six articles:—

"1. The Roman Catholic religion is to be maintained and protected, with all the rights and privileges secured to it by the sacred canons, in all those provinces in which it predominates.

"2. The *Placetum Regium* is abolished.

"3. The right of the Bishops to communicate with the Papal Chair in spiritual matters, as also with the clergy and people, and to issue instructions and ordinances in spiritual matters is recognized.

"4. The Bishops alone have the right to appoint their vicars and counselors, to ordain, or to refuse to ordain those priests whom they may consider unworthy, to found or to divide livings or rectories, to order public prayers, to convoke synods, to publish pastoral letters and spiritual rescripts, and to prohibit dangerous books.

"5. The Bishops are to watch over the religious instruction given to the youth of the country in all public and private schools. All Roman Catholic elementary schools are to be under the direction of a clerical inspector.

"6. The Bishops are to appoint the catechists, and no one will be allowed to teach theology or canonical law without their permission.

"7. Agreeably to the canons or conditions of the Council of Trent (it sat from 1545 to 1563) clerical matters will be settled by clerical judges, and temporal judges will only meddle in matrimonial matters when they relate to the spiritual (should probably be 'temporal') consequences of that sacrament, (marriage.)

"8. The Bishops have the full right to punish the clergy who may offend against the discipline of the Church, and to condemn to punishment those who may offend against the canons of the Church. The civil courts will only have to take cognizance of civil matters and of crimes committed by the clergy, but even then the Bishop must previously receive notice of what is about to be done.

"9. In the prisons the clergy are to be separated from the laymen. The immunities of the churches shall be maintained as long as they do not interfere with the public security.

"10. Disputes with laymen in respect to the right of patronage to be decided by temporal courts.

"11. Oral and written defamation of the Catholic religion, of the holy Liturgy, of Bishops, and of priests, will not be tolerated. (This translation is from the German, but in the *Gazetta di Venezia* the sentence begins, "The Emperor is bound not to tolerate oral or written defamation," &c.)

"12. The opinions of the Bishops of the province will be taken at the presentation of new Bishops to the Papal Chair.

"13. The Bishops alone have rights over the seminaries, (theological,) and it is for them to appoint the rectors, professors, and teachers.

"14. The rectors are to be chosen by concurrence, (*konkurs*.) The principal dignitaries of the chapter are to be nominated by the Papal Chair, when there is no right patronage. The others are to be appointed by the Emperor, excepting when there is a right of patronage, or the Bishops receive permission to fill up the vacant places.

"15. To the Emperor is given the privilege of appointing to all deaneries and rectories, when there is a right of patronage belonging to religious and school property, on condition that his choice shall fall on one of three persons who shall be proposed by the Bishops after a previous regular concurrence, (*konkurs*.)

"16. The Papal Chair, with the consent of the Emperor, has full power to establish new sees, and to make new divisions of those already existing.

"17. His Majesty undertakes to give a sufficient *kongrua* (if the root of the word is *congruere* it must here mean Imperial confirmations) to those rectories which are at present without them.

"18. The property of the Church will be managed according to the directions of the canonical institutions, and in regard to its possession those regulations will be followed which are prescribed by the canons.

"19. The clergy belonging to the monasteries have a right to free communication with their superiors residing at Rome, and the latter have the full right to visit the convents in the empire, and to issue circulars respecting discipline, &c.

"20. The monastic orders have the right to establish noviciates, (institutions for the instruction of persons intending to retire from the world,) and the Bishops, after having come to an understanding with the Government, to establish new monasteries and cloisters.

"21. The property of the Church is declared sacred and inviolable. The Church has also the full right to acquire new property.

"22. No suppression of the property of the Church, and no sale of the same can take place, without the intervention of the Papal Chair. The rights of the Bishops are never to be infringed on.

"23. The property of the Church is to be managed according to the canonical ordinances. A mixed commission will be appointed for the administration of the vacant benefices.

"24. The right to levy tithes to be maintained wherever it exists, and his Majesty pledges himself to give to the Church a good title to claim them wherever it may be wanting.

"25. All other matters which are not mentioned in this Concordat will be arranged according to the doctrines of the Church, and the existing arrangements which may be approved by the Papal Chair.

"26. The Concordat is declared to be a State law for ever, and all the laws and agreements which have hitherto been valid in ecclesiastical matters are abolished throughout the empire."

The ultimate design of this new league between the Pope and Austria, in which the Emperor has conceded rights always held by his predecessors, is of course but conjecture. A clever contemporary theorizes after the following manner:

"Austria has taken refuge in the bosom of the Church against the dangers of revolution. Rome has taken refuge in the bosom of Austria against the dangers threatened by the alliance of France and England.

"The policy of the Western Alliance contemplates the aggrandizement of Sardinia, the humiliation of King Bomba of Naples, and the division of the spiritual and temporal power in the states of the Church. This latter object is known to be a favorite one of Louis Napoleon. For this, if for no other reason, the Pope is peculiarly jealous of the French Emperor, and longs to see French bayonets displaced by Austrian bayonets in the seven-hilled city. Meanwhile, everybody in Rome is involved in doubt and suspense. The people are looking with interest towards England and France. The Pope and the clergy have their faces turned towards Austria."

CHURCH IN CANADA.

The following Dispatch has been received in Canada, from the Secretary of the Colonies. It settles a most important question for the Church, which has now nothing to do but go to work.

Despatch No. 36, from Sir William Molesworth to Sir Edmund Head, is as follows:

"Downing Street,
24th September, 1855.

"Sir:

"With reference to Lord J. Russell's Dispatch of the 4th of May last, acknowledging an address to her Majesty from the Legislative Council and Commons of Canada in Parliament assembled, praying for the repeal of such English Statutes as impede the meeting of the Clergy and Laity of the Church of England in Synod, and that the choice of Bishops may be left to the Clergy and Laity of the Diocese,

"I now enclose for your information a copy of a letter received from the Law Advisers of the Crown, to whom the subject had been referred by his Lordship.

You will perceive from the terms of that letter the difficulties which must necessarily impede Her Majesty's Government in dealing with that subject, regarding as it does the rights and position of members of the Church of England not in Canada only, but throughout the colonial possessions of the empire.

"Her Majesty's Government will, however, not fail to take the whole question into their earnest consideration: and, notwithstanding the legal or rather constitutional objections adverted to in the letter which I now transmit, I am myself thoroughly persuaded that the desire for freedom of action and self-government on behalf of the Church of England in Canada, is just and reasonable for the reasons specified in the Address and in your dispatch.

"For the present, however, further delay is unavoidable. And, as it appears

to me that the division of the Diocese of Toronto is so much desired that it may be very inconvenient to postpone it until the general question is disposed of, I have to inform you that Her Majesty's Government are prepared to take the necessary steps for this purpose, whenever required so to do, and that they will recommend to Her Majesty for appointment to the new bishoprics such clergymen as you may yourself designate to them after consulting with the bishop and such authorities of the Church of England, in the colony, as you may think advisable and taking such precautions as to the inefficiency of the means for endowing such a bishopric as you may judge necessary.

"You will have the goodness to communicate a copy of this dispatch forthwith on my part to the Bishop of Toronto.

(Signed,)

I have, &c.,
WILLIAM MOLESWORTH."

THE BRITISH COLONIAL BISHOPS.

The following return of the number of Colonial Bishops, stating the salaries of each, and sources whence those salaries are derived, has been presented to Parliament:—

- Quebec*—George Jehoshaphat Mountain, £1,990, Imperial Parliamentary vote.
Toronto—John Strachan, £1,250, Clergy Reserves in Canada West.
Montreal—Francis Fulford, £800, Colonial Bishoprics' Fund.
Nova Scotia—Hibbert Binney, \$700, interest of Trust Fund appropriated to the endowment of this see by the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel.
Frederickton—John Medley, £1,000, Colonial Bishoprics' Fund.
Newfoundland—Edward Feild, \$1,200; £300 Parliamentary vote as Archdeacon of Newfoundland; £200 Parliamentary vote; £200 Colonial Funds, as Archdeacon of Bermuda; £500 from Society for the Propagation of the Gospel as Bishop of Newfoundland.
Rupert's Land—David Anderson, £700, Colonial Bishoprics' Fund.
Jamaica—Aubrey George Spencer, £3,000, Consolidated Fund.
Barbadoes—Thomas Parry, £2,500, Consolidated Fund.
Antigua—Daniel Gateward Davis, \$2,000, Consolidated Fund.
Guiana—William Piercy Austin, £2,000, Consolidated Fund.
Sydney—Frederic Barker, £1,500, General Colonial Revenue, under Schedu (C) annexed to Act 5 and 6, Vict. c. 76.
Melbourne—Charles Perry, \$1,333 6s. 8d.; £1,000 Colonial Treasury; \$333 6s. 8d., Colonial Bishoprics' Fund.
Newcastle—William Tyrrell, £833 6s. 8d.; £500 Colonial Treasury; £333 6s. 8d. Colonial Bishoprics' Fund.
Adelaide—Augustus Short, £800, Colonial Bishoprics' Fund.
Tasmania—Francis Russell Nixon, £1,250; £1,000 for salary and allowances from Colonial Funds, and the interest of £5,000 granted by the Colonial Bishoprics' Fund.
New Zealand—George Augustus Selwyn, £600, Colonial Bishopric's Fund.
Cape Town—Robert Gray, £800, Colonial Bishoprics' Fund.
Colombo—James Chapman, £2,000, Colonial Funds.
Victoria—George Smith, £1,000, Colonial Bishoprics' Fund.
Gibraltar—George Tomlinson, £1,200, Colonial Bishopric's Fund.
Sierra Leone—J. W. Weeks, £900; £500 as Colonial Chaplain, £400 from Colonial Bishoprics' Fund.
Mauritius—Vincent William Ryan, £850: £600 as Senior Chaplain from Colonial Funds, and the interest of £6,300 granted by Colonial Bishoprics' Fund.
Graham's Town—John Armstrong, £800 Colonial Bishoprics' Fund.
Natal—John William Colenso, £800, Colonial Bishoprics' Fund.
Labuan—Francis T. M'Dougall, £500, Colonial Bishoprics' Fund.